

who shun the battle make poor critics of its loss.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 17, 1966]

STRIKE LOSS HERE PUT AT \$1 BILLION BY BUSINESS UNIT—COMMERCE ASSOCIATION ASKS FOR A RAISE IN FARE TO PAY FOR TRANSIT SETTLEMENT—MAYOR BACKED ON FACT—JOHNSON'S CRITICISM TERMED UNFAIR BY JAVITS—WIRTZ ASSAILED BY GILHOOLEY
(By Emanuel Perlmutter)

The Commerce & Industry Association estimated yesterday that the 12-day transit strike cost New Yorkers \$1 billion and that "less than 25 percent will be recovered."

The association asked that the 15-cent fare be increased to help pay for the strike settlement, which has been estimated as costing between \$62 and \$70 million. The group also said it would ask Governor Rockefeller today to sponsor three tougher measures to bar strikes by public employees.

Ralph C. Gross, executive vice president of the association, outlined the group's stand during the WCBS-TV "Newsmakers" program and in an interview afterward.

JAVITS DEFENDS PACT

Meanwhile, two Republicans came to the defense of Mayor Lindsay in his controversy with the Democratic national administration over the strike settlement.

The agreement has been defended by Mr. Lindsay. But President Johnson and Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz have criticized it for being in excess of the 3.2 percent wage-increase guideline that the Federal administration deemed necessary to prevent inflation.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York, just back from a 6-day day trip to South Vietnam, said that the President's criticism "wasn't fair." He made this comment after an appearance on the WABC-TV "Page One" program.

John J. Gilhooley, the only Republican on the three-man transit authority, restricted his criticism to Secretary Wirtz.

"I must say, as far as I'm concerned, it was not the bravest act of Mr. Wirtz's career to shoot our young mayor in the back after he'd made the difficult decision to raise New York from it knees," Mr. Gilhooley said on the WNBC-TV "Searchlight" program.

In discussing the Commerce and Industry Association's legislative request, Mr. Gross said the group would ask for three measures to amend or replace the Condon-Wadlin law, which he said had proved ineffective in barring strikes by public employees.

"We will ask for laws penalizing the leaders of a public union who call a strike, penalties against them if they threaten one and escalating fines against the union treasury if a strike takes place," Mr. Gross said.

The Condon-Wadlin law imposes job penalties against striking employees, but none against their union or its leaders. The leaders and union may however, be punished for violating court orders based on the law.

On the question of the strike losses, Mr. Gross said the major costs were in wages paid to workers who could not come in to work, to employees who received no pay because they did not work and to the hundreds of small retail establishments that lost purchases that would not be made later.

He estimated that more than 185 million man-hours of employment had been lost.

Mr. Gross said after the television program that the association believed that a fare increase was necessary to pay for the new transit contract.

"I personally believe it should be 25 cents, and that an increase to 20 cents would only meet the transit deficit for about 2 years," he added.

Senator JAVITS, in defending the size of the strike settlement, said that Mayor Lindsay

"did all he could, he handled himself well." The Republican legislator said the strike resulted from "the failure of laws in State and Nation to deal with a situation of this kind."

Governor Rockefeller has promised to ask the legislature to provide \$100 million in aid to New York City quickly to help it pay for transit needs.

However, legislation will be needed to give the city permission to transfer funds to the autonomous transit authority. Mr. Gilhooley said yesterday that he was convinced that such legislation would be passed.

WIDNALL AND CURTIS CHALLENGE ADMINISTRATION TO ACT IN NEW YORK TRANSIT STRIKE: CALL FOR CONGRESSIONAL INVOLVEMENT

Two senior Republican Members of Congress, Representatives WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey, and THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, challenged the Johnson administration to go on record in favor of a noninflationary wage settlement in the New York transit strike. They said the President's efforts to date would be of no help to the harrassed millions in the metropolitan area of New Jersey, Connecticut, and New York. WIDNALL, the ranking Republican on the House Banking and Currency Committee and cosponsor of the Mass Transportation Act of 1964, and CURTIS, the senior House Republican on the Joint Economic Committee, who both represent urban areas, said that the outcome of this strike could break the Johnson administration's own wage-price guidelines, and would have repercussions in Greater St. Louis and other metropolitan areas throughout the country where transportation is a problem. They called for congressional observers at the collective bargaining table to speed settlement, to check on the usefulness of the wage-price guidelines, and to seek possible legislative solutions to future collective-bargaining problems.

The text of their statement follows:

"The announcement by President Johnson that, as a result of the New York transit strike, he has urged Federal agencies to help relieve the suffering involved is nothing but a consolation prize for the harrassed millions of Americans in the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut metropolitan area. In the first place, the programs he suggests using, the poverty program's small business loans, the regular small business loan and disaster loan program, home mortgages, and depressed areas legislation have the end result of only postponing or increasing an individual's debts. In the case of the small business loan program, it is so short of funds, and in such a state of chaos itself, despite a year's effort on our part to correct this situation, that it is doubtful if it can be of any immediate significant assistance. More importantly, however, the President's announcement completely ignores the basic problem which is to end an illegal strike by a union which has been demanding an excessive wage increase of 15 percent which would make a mockery of the President's own 3.2-percent wage-price guidelines.

"The same Johnson administration that made front page headlines by denouncing attempts by business to raise prices is strangely and mysteriously silent when it comes to excessive demands by labor. Apparently the guidelines are important, depending upon who they are supposed to guide. National labor leaders, who are so fond of lecturing Congress on excessive business profits, on mass transportation needs, on the problems of the workingman and the poor have not been heard from either. Yet here is a strike that materially hurts millions of other workers, that breaks the wage-price guidelines, that punishes the public, that is particularly hard on the low-income citizen who more than anyone else depends upon public transportation, and that is illegal to boot. We would challenge these labor leaders to use

their influence to assist in obtaining a prompt, noninflationary settlement and a return to a rule of law and not of men."

"U.S. Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz has indicated to the press that there are few legal tools the President can use to push a responsible settlement. We agree that Congress has provided little authority for the President to act to control wages and prices, but that didn't bother the administration any when it used stockpile metal to roll back aluminum prices and threatened the shifting of defense contracts to force the so-called steel price compromise. Secretary Wirtz is obviously trying to set up the public to buy the idea that President Johnson's personal action will have generated a strike settlement even though it involves a wage contract in excess of the administration's own guidelines. Such a settlement would adversely affect millions of Americans in the New York, New Jersey, Connecticut metropolitan area who rely on adequate and inexpensive public transportation. If this can happen in New York, it can happen in greater St. Louis or any metropolitan area in the Nation.

"We believe the President, Secretary Wirtz, and the Council of Economic Advisers, headed by Chairman Gardner Ackley, have a responsibility to go on record immediately in favor of holding the line on inflation in the greater New York transit dispute, acting with the same vigor previously reserved only for the Nation's business community. In addition, we suggest that bipartisan congressional observers from the appropriate committees be invited to the negotiation sessions to see the wage-price guidelines in action and to learn what may need to be done in the way of legislation to break such impasses in the collective bargaining process. The congressional group could include, for example, members from committees involved in labor and transportation matters, as well as from the Joint Economic Committee. The mere presence of Members of Congress, should hasten a responsible settlement, which is what harrassed greater New York metropolitan area residents want most of all.

ANNUAL REPORT ON FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

To the Congress of the United States:

The annual report on the foreign assistance program of the United States for fiscal year 1965, which I here transmit, shows what Americans have done during the past 12 months to help other people help themselves.

The record of these months offers new testimony to our continuing conviction that our own peace and prosperity here at home depend on continued progress toward a better life for people everywhere.

In pursuit of that goal, we have, during this past year, placed new emphasis on the basic problem of securing more food for the world's population.

We have agreed to extend technical assistance to countries asking for help on population programs. At the same time, our overseas missions have been directed to give priorities to projects for achiev-

January 17, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

297

was not successful then, and have little reason to believe that I will be any more successful today, but I hope that those who share my views that we should strive for accuracy, integrity, and economy, and who are opposed to fraud and deception, will understand that these remarks are intended to be constructive, and will lend their cooperation in restoring accuracy and sanity to the RECORD.

VIETNAM COSTS VERSUS DOMESTIC PROGRAMS

(Mr. CEDERBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson indicated in his state of the Union message that the war in Vietnam is no reason to hold the line on spending for domestic programs. He inferred that those of us who have a concern about increased spending at this time for domestic programs that can be deferred are caloused in our concern for human needs.

The Defense Department for years has indicated to Congress the continuing need for military family housing. Defense Department testimony before our Military Construction Appropriation Subcommittee indicates we have several thousand military families living in substandard housing, some in deplorable condition.

In spite of these facts the Defense Department deferred construction of the 2,500 military family houses approved by this Congress last year. Obviously this was done because of our increasing requirements for expenditures in South Vietnam.

The policy appears to be guns and whipping cream for the civilian economy but only guns with a little skimmed milk for our military families.

Why this obvious discrimination, Mr. President?

If pressing housing needs for military families can be deferred, is it unreasonable to expect similar restraint be required of the rest of our economy?

NEW YORK'S TRANSIT CRISIS: THE COSTLY POLITICS OF L.B.J.

(Mr. WIDNALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, this morning's papers carry an estimate by the Commerce and Industry Association of New York City that the recent illegal transit strike in that metropolitan area cost \$1 billion, and less than 25 percent of that will never be recovered. The majority of this cost fell upon those businesses who had to pay for work never performed since their employees could not get to work and those employees who lost wages during the 12-day period because they could not get to work, plus the hundreds of small retail establishments. In all cases, the greatest burden will have fallen on those least able to

afford it; the low-income worker and the small businessman.

Nor does this take into account the future cost as a result of the strike settlement, a settlement that the New York Times has correctly called "a compromise accommodation made under duress" on the part of city officials. Someone is going to have to pay for the settlement, and it will either have to come out of the fare box, in which case it will be paid for by those who have suffered the most from the strike already, or through some kind of public subsidy. The latter, if it occurs, will probably be shared by the taxpayers of the city, State, and Nation.

It is an unfortunate fact that the President of the United States, after making no effort to prevent the damage, has broadened its impact by his after-the-fact lament condemning the final settlement. It will be recalled that at no time during the 12-day strike was there a word from the President, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, or the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Gardner Ackley, condemning the wage demands of the transit union as out of line with the administration's own wage-price guidelines as has so firmly been done with price increase proposals on the part of business. At no time did any Johnson administration figure speak out against the union defiance of the laws and the courts of the State of New York. Then, in what the New York Times has described as a "blatantly political" comment, the President took the city of New York to task without one word about the cause of it all.

It may be possible to assess the damage this strike caused to the people of New York and the surrounding metropolitan area, and to estimate the future costs of the settlement. The damage to the judicial and moral structure of the Nation's largest city and second largest State, and the injury to the image, prestige, and effectiveness of the Presidency as an unbiased umpire in the economic arena, however, are incalculable. I hesitate to even mention the possible impact on the national interest should the New York transit strike be used as an example and as a signal for similar crisis in other parts of the country.

I include at this point an editorial from the New York Times of January 15, 1966, an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of January 15, 1966, and an article from the New York Times of January 17, 1966. I would also like to call attention to the press release that follows these newspaper articles which contains the joint statement by Congressman Thomas B. CURTIS, of Missouri, and myself, calling on the President to take a firm position on the demands and actions of the union, which is dated January 9, 1966, several days before the settlement.

The articles and release follow:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 15, 1966]

POLITICS, THE L.B.J. WAY

Through all the 12 days that New York was crippled by a transit strike called in

defiance of law and court order President Johnson had not a word of condemnation for the union leaders responsible for the exercise in economic blackmail of a city. Now that the siege has been lifted with a costly settlement, Mr. Johnson suddenly finds his voice, and censures New York for paying too high a price for its freedom.

The President is quite right in stating that the peace terms breach his anti-inflation guidelines. As we observed in these columns yesterday, none of the adroit arguments advanced in support of the pact by Dr. Nathan P. Feinsinger, chairman of Mayor Lindsay's special mediation board, could make it fit inside even an elastic interpretation of the guidelines. It was a compromise accommodation made under duress; and only the mayor's resolve not to "capitulate before the lawless demands of a single power group" prevented outright surrender.

If Mr. Johnson had seriously wanted to act against an inflationary settlement, he had ample opportunity to do so. On any one of the 12 days he could have denounced the strike as a threat to the national interest—which the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Gardner Ackley, now acknowledges it was—and he could have supported Mr. Lindsay in the mayor's unheeded call for arbitration, factfinding, or a retroactive contract extension. But the President did not choose to do so.

Such help from Mr. Johnson would have been doubly meaningful in the light of attempts by some elements in the old-time Democratic-labor cabal in this city to exploit the strike as an instrument for humiliating the new Republican-fusion mayor, thus hoping to kill his future political career.

Now that Mr. Lindsay and the city have survived the strike, the President contributes his meed toward discrediting the settlement. The blatantly political character of his comment is underscored by the continued absence of any direct criticism of the Transport Workers Union for its coercion of the community. He declares himself "quite disturbed that essential services could be paralyzed for so long"; but there is not a hint of who is to blame. Not a word about flouting the law and the courts, not a syllable about the damage to the moral and judicial structure of this, the largest city in the United States.

The President's remarks provide a discouraging setting for the recommendations he has promised to send to Congress to protect the public interest against such strikes. Reports from Washington indicate that his state of the Union pledge of tighter strike curbs was toned down before delivery in response to objections voiced by George Meany. If even the promise must be diluted before it gets to Capitol Hill, what real hope is there in this administration for effective protection for the public against public-service strikes?

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 15, 1966]

A BIT LATE, MR. PRESIDENT

New York's transit strike was barely ended when President Johnson pronounced his anathema: "Candor requires me to say that I am quite disturbed that essential services could be paralyzed for so long, and I am equally concerned by the cost of the settlement (which) violates our national guideposts for noninflationary wage increases. I do not believe that any settlement that violates the guideposts to this extent is in the national interest."

We agree. But that bit of Presidential candor would have come with better grace and more effect a few days earlier. Soldiers

January 17, 1966

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. Res. 173. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain investigations, and to provide additional funds therefor (Rept. No. 941); referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. Res. 172. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Banking and Currency (Rept. No. 940); referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (REPT. NO. 942)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I submit the 15th annual report of the activities of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, with material on mobilization from departments and agencies, and ask that it may be printed. I ask unanimous consent that a release, prepared by me, relating to the report, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed; and, without objection, the release will be printed in the RECORD.

The release is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA, ON ANNUAL REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, in releasing the committee's 15th annual report, called attention to the fact that the report discloses increasing use of priority assistance for critical materials and military items, upward pressures on prices, and increasing demands similar to those which led to the necessity for price controls, industrywide allocations of material and products, and other emergency measures of a wartime nature during World War II and Korea.

Adequate fiscal and monetary policies are necessary, Senator ROBERTSON stressed, in order to reduce the danger that such direct controls may have to be imposed.

The Joint Committee on Defense Production has the responsibility for reviewing programs under the Defense Production Act, which provides the authority currently being used to insure timely production for the Vietnam conflict. It was under the Defense Production Act that American productive capacity of critical materials and products was greatly increased during the Korean war and that the economy was regulated through price controls and allocations.

In releasing the report, Chairman ROBERTSON stated:

"The report indicates that the economy is beginning to show the impact of the Vietnam buildup and that in areas of heavy defense production the already short supply of manpower may get serious. Some shortages of capacity have developed and other industries are operating at or near capacity."

The authority for priorities and allocations of materials provided in the Defense Production Act has become increasingly important to insuring the delivery of weapons to Vietnam. The report states:

"As the Vietnam situation became intensified and our commitments became heavier, the use of priority ratings has become absolutely vital to delivery of end items."

Senator ROBERTSON pointed out that recent increases in the price of materials have almost wiped out the book loss of over \$1.2 billion in Government inventories of critical materials which has been widely publicized in the recent past. These book losses resulted from declines in market prices of materials from the high prices paid for such materials during the Korean war. Senator ROBERTSON stated:

"The elimination of \$1.2 billion in book losses during a 2-year period provides additional evidence that inflation is with us. The materials markets cannot be separated from the remainder of the economy. As the cost of inflation passes on to the producers of materials, the resulting price increases will be reflected in every segment of the economy. Materials are required to build and to operate the assembly lines that supply the needs of both the military and the civilian economy."

With regard to the effect of these price increases, Senator ROBERTSON said:

"While the United States may recover losses or make substantial profits on its inventory of materials during this inflationary period, the buying public will not have a similar offset against inflation."

Much of the national stockpile was acquired through purchases of materials from expanded production authorized in the Defense Product Act. Senator ROBERTSON further stated:

"The emergency needs of the Vietnam war again demonstrate the necessity for maintaining adequate quantities of essential materials to meet any emergency and the need for carrying out long range programs for the sale of surplus materials, while giving due consideration to market conditions, in order that the right materials will be available in the right quantities at the right time."

"Unneeded materials, such as excesses purchased under Public Law 206 contrary to the views of this committee for non-defense purposes, do not help us solve the copper shortage."

In further commenting on emergency needs for materials, Senator ROBERTSON said:

"I favor an up-to-date review of the emergency needs for each strategic and critical material, with due regard to our dependence on foreign sources, population changes, production methods, total commitments, and related factors. Such study should give consideration to expediting requirements figures from the military services and improving the methods for translating weapons requirements into materials requirements promptly and without delay."

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Robert C. Weaver, of New York, to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; and

Robert C. Wood, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 2771. A bill for the relief of Hazel Louise Schuman Strunk; and

S. 2772. A bill for the relief of Bozica Pucnik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 2773. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Olalla division of the Umpqua project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina):

S. 2774. A bill to grant the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across the Savannah River between South Carolina and Georgia; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. THURMOND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 2775. A bill to provide for payment of survivor annuities to the widows of certain former Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 2776. A bill to amend the Social Security Amendments of 1965 so as to eliminate therefrom certain provisions which deny hospital insurance benefits to certain individuals otherwise eligible therefor because of their membership in certain subversive organizations or their prior conviction of crimes involving subversive activities; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 2777. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to eliminate the provisions which deny social security and hospital insurance benefits to uninsured individuals who are employees or members of certain organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Missouri when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONTROYA (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. McGEE, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MOSS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. FULBRIGHT):

S. 2778. A bill to amend the act providing financial assistance to local educational agencies for the education of children of low-income families in order to provide financial assistance for the education of orphans and other children lacking parental support; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONTROYA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEARSON:

S. 2779. A bill for the relief of Maria Lourdes Sunga Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. PEARSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 2780. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an optional simplified tax method, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Louisiana when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 2781. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Monmouth-Dallas division, Willamette River project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

January 17, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

325

political persuasions, but said they all spoke Cambodian. They had been discharged or transferred to Phnom Penh by the time of my visit.

MONDULKIRI VISITED

On the morning of December 16, aboard a vintage Cambodian Army DC-3, I flew east to Senmonorum, the capital of Monduliri province. I was accompanied by Ches San, a former Cambodian diplomat now serving at Secretary of State for Information.

Bordering the Vietnamese provinces of Darlac and Quangduc, Monduliri was created only 5 years ago in an effort to populate and fortify Cambodia's eastern frontier region in line with the historic fear of Vietnamese intrusion. None of Cambodia's 400,000 Vietnamese residents is permitted to reside in the area.

It is an uninviting region of rolling, treeless hills, so poor that it must import rice. Apart from primitive tribes, its population is composed of only 1,000 families, half of them dependents of a local battalion, half of them "pioneers." Its military governor, Maj. Khieu Boun, is a former French Army sergeant who fought against the Vietminh when it unsuccessfully attempted to invade Cambodia in March 1954.

FEW SIGNS OF LIFE

This area has been considered a southernmost extension of the "Ho Chi Minh trail." His leathery face wrinkling into an ironic smile, Boun scoffed at the allegation: "If we are so poor ourselves, how could we nourish the Vietcong?"

I suggested a closer look at the neighborhood, and we climbed into Boun's Land-rover, heading southeast over what maps generously call National Highway 14. Actually it is a narrow dirt road that parallels the Vietnam border as it winds through barren hills. The only sign of life we saw in 2 hours was a truckdriver changing a tire on his gravel truck.

We passed a scarred hillside where 2 years ago, a U.S. transport airplane crashed, killing its eight crewmen. Though American sources believe the aircraft suffered from mechanical failure, Boun proudly explained that his men had brought down the intruder with submachinegun fire.

Finally we reached Camp Le Rolland, a former French outpost sometimes cited as a Vietcong base. I had expected a romantic fort in Beau Geste style. Instead I found a bleak square of earthworks garrisoned by a handful of shabby Cambodian provincial guards.

From the camp I could look into Vietnam, observing through binoculars an American special force outpost at Buprang 4 miles away. The bucolic scene seemed as peaceful as a Sunday in New England.

Did traffic pass into Vietnam? We pushed on along Highway 14. Within 50 yards it dwindled into a weedy path. Within a mile it stopped at a wall of jungle.

It was near there that, by chance, we met a typical Cambodian frontier patrol—four barefoot tribesmen with filed teeth and distended earlobes, three of them carrying ancient French or British rifles. They could not recall seeing Vietnamese in the area. But then, one of them volunteered, he would not recognize a Vietnamese if he saw one.

Familiar as they are with the countryside, such tribesmen seem a woefully inadequate force. Moreover, Cambodia's entire military strength in its eastern border area is fewer than four battalions, most of them working on farms, roads and rubber plantations.

After spending the night at Lomphat, the mosquito-infested capital of Rattanakiri Province, we set out by helicopter to cover the more sensitive northeastern frontier sector.

It is here that the Vietcong is said to be flying its flags brazenly over training camps. It is here that Communist supply trucks are

supposed to ply highways. It is here that North Vietnam's elusive 325th Division allegedly has its headquarters, and it is here that its troops are reported to retreat to rest and regroup.

Flying at about 100 feet, we cruised over Highway 19, barren except for a few bicycles. Along the way we observed Bo Kheo, described in some press reports as a key Communist post. It is a sprawling village whose alleged "radio antennae" are primitive bamboo and rope contraptions used in its local zircon mines.

At Oyadao Highway 19 ends abruptly at a river whose bridge was destroyed over a decade ago in the Indochina war. Here we found some 400 Vietnamese refugees who fled into Cambodia last August. In the opinion of Ches San, the Cambodian official with me, however, these miserable peasants were potential aggressors who had no business in his country.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Dec. 31, 1965]

SOUTH CAMBODIA SEEMS LIKELIER VIETCONG ARENA

(By Stanley Karnow)

HONG KONG, December 30.—Cambodia's southern border with Vietnam would seem a more propitious sector for minor Vietcong activities than its impoverished eastern frontier, where my trip by helicopter and plane turned up no solid evidence that the Vietcong have established a "hard base" there.

From my 2-day tour of the southern zone I could not determine whether the Vietcong used it as extensively as they did some years ago. In September 1961, for example, the Cambodian Army discovered 500 guerrillas camped in Svay Rieng Province, driving them back into Vietnam after a 2-hour battle.

I could deduce, however, that this stretch of the border is far leakier than Cambodian officials would publicly acknowledge—although one official privately admitted, "What we don't see, we don't know."

AS LOW AS 100 FEET

Before examining the southeastern border I completed my tour of the northeast frontier, helicoptering over many areas at altitudes as low as 100 feet.

I noted that an apparently uninhabited plateau of jungle interspersed with swamps extends far into Vietnamese territory before it reaches the Annamite Mountains. This contradicts some press accounts that describe the Vietcong "disappearing over the mountains into Cambodia."

At Lom Kom, a lonely outpost 3 miles inside the border, a young Cambodian lieutenant said he had never seen Vietcong or Vietnamese Government troops cross the frontier. "I am not saying they are not here," he added carefully. "I have just never met them."

TRIBESMEN CONCUR

Tribesmen who patrol the region concurred. As to local natives giving rice to Vietnamese, they said, "We cannot feed outsiders. We are short of food ourselves."

We then wound down the serpentine Iad-rang Valley, and saw nothing stir except a frightened deer. We touched down at Vocone Sai, another alleged Vietcong camp, and found a sleepy riverside settlement preoccupied with its experiments to improve rice production.

That the Vietcong may slip in and out of the eastern border region, I cannot doubt. But unless they have miraculous means for getting food, I find it hard to imagine that the sector could constitute what guerrillas call a "hard base."

RIVERS DESERTED

That the area serves as a significant Communist supply route seems to me unlikely. Its rivers were deserted. Except for

the Mekong River, the region's roads and waterways run east-west rather than north-south. When the Vietminh invaded Cambodia in 1954, they came down the Mekong Valley, an impossibility for them at present.

The southern area, by contrast, is lush, abundant in rice and other food. On the Cambodian side it is largely populated by Vietnamese who, denied Cambodian citizenship even by birth, are politically unreliable. It is also a region in which smuggling continues, much like the free trade of French colonial days.

Legal commerce between Cambodia and South Vietnam has been severely curtailed since the two countries broke diplomatic relations. Truck traffic has ceased between Phnom Penh and Saigon, and even a secondary road from Phnom Den over the border the Apannong has been blocked. Cambodian river barges cannot enter Vietnam, and Vietnamese barges are barred from Cambodia.

Nevertheless, Vietnamese goods are widely available, especially in border areas.

SHOPS OVERFLOWING

At the village of Phnom Den, for instance, I found local shops overflowing with plastic toys, soap, shirts, and kitchen utensils, all made in Saigon. Everywhere in Cambodia I encountered Saigon beer, which Cambodians prefer to the heavy brews imported from Eastern Europe.

Some of this merchandise enters Cambodia through frontier barter markets tolerated by both governments. But most of it appears to be handled by well organized Chinese and Vietnamese smugglers. And it seems plausible that, for strictly commercial motives, they sell rice, chemicals and other products to the Vietcong.

After all, even Cambodia's Prime Minister, Prince Norodom Kantol, told me that he would sell rice to the Vietcong—if they paid a top price in hard currency.

Though roads and waterways are officially closed, merchandise may cross the border aboard nocturnal sampans or on coolie's backs. When Chief of State Norodom Sihanouk gave 40 cases of medicine to the Vietcong last September, there was no doubt they would find their way into Vietnam. In a similar manner, Vietcong agents traverse the frontier.

At Bavet, a border post in Svay Rieng province, I asked the local governor where the frontier might be crossed illegally. Such crossings, he replied, were "formally prohibited." He declined to clarify, however, how the Australian Communist writer, Wilfred Burchett and various Vietcong representatives travel back and forth to Vietnam. He also refused to point out where two American prisoners, released by the Vietcong in Cambodia last month, were taken across the border.

A RING OF TRUTH

With all this, there is a ring of truth to the tales of wounded Vietcong seeking refuge over the border, or Vietcong agents entering Cambodia to recruit skilled Vietnamese workers.

In a broader sense, however, it remains to be judged whether these details, deductions and suppositions add up to a significant indictment of Cambodia. Moreover, the Cambodians must apparently produce evidence of their innocence while their accusers have yet to offer firm evidence of Cambodian guilt.

Thus the possible extension of the Vietnam war into Cambodia, while serious, seems bewildering—and dangerous.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

stopping in Saigon for a briefing on the suspicious areas to note inside Cambodia.

Accompanied by a Cambodian official, but free to choose my itinerary—or improvise it en route—I covered much of the Vietnam border, often landing along the way in remote outposts. In addition, I spent a day in Sihanoukville.

Proving this negative charge of border violations is difficult, particularly where unmarked frontiers stretch for miles under a canopy of vegetation. It would take thousands of men several years to examine every foot of the Cambodian border area adjacent to Vietnam.

IMPLAUSIBLE ACCUSATIONS

However, it was possible to measure certain charges against firsthand observations—and in every case the accusations turned out to be implausible.

The charge made by Thailand's Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman last September, that 27,000 Chinese were learning guerrilla tactics at Sihanoukville, seemed to lack any shred of credibility. Nor does Sihanoukville, which abounds with Western shipping agents, appear a satisfactory landing place for Vietcong weapons when compared to the coasts of Vietnam itself.

The charge that Cambodia's roads and rivers are used as Vietcong supply routes appears equally unlikely. Highway 19, which once ran into Vietnam's highlands, now ends abruptly at a river whose bridge was destroyed a decade ago. Highway 14, in southeast Cambodia, fades into jungle 2 miles from the Vietnam border.

NO RED CAMPS FOUND

Another charge published is that Vietcong training camps, with Vietcong flags flying, dot the Cambodian countryside. But a cruise around the region at an altitude of 100 feet revealed no such camps. There was a charge that the hospital at Kampot, not far from Sihanoukville, is used by the Vietcong. Within the past 2 months, about 20 Cambodian refugees from Vietnam have been brought into the hospital, suffering from gunshot wounds.

Many of the border villages within Cambodia have markets stocked with Vietnamese merchandise, from plastic toys and soap to cigarettes and pans. This suggests a lively smuggling trade between the two countries.

Some 300,000 Chinese and 400,000 Vietnamese reside in Cambodia, and some of these are known to profit handsomely from smuggling.

Furthermore, it is difficult to believe the official Cambodian assertion that Vietcong operatives do not cross into Cambodia to tax local Vietnamese residents or recruit them. After all, the Vietcong official, Tran Buu Klen, turns up in Phnom Penh occasionally while the Australian Communist journalist Wilfred Burchette, who resides in Phnom Penh, frequently crosses the border to interview Vietcong leaders in Vietnam's Tay Ninh Province.

DIFFICULT SANCTUARY

Beyond these details, however, the key question is whether Cambodia is a significant sanctuary for the Vietcong.

In the judgment of Western analysts here, northeast Cambodia, supposedly the strongest base region for the Vietcong and North Vietnamese, is deficient in rice, supporting its own scarce population with great difficulty.

Moreover, it would seem very much against Communist guerrilla strategy to build a "hard base" in an uncontrolled foreign land governed by a chief of state whose political sentiments are variable.

And finally, it is doubtful that the Cambodians, who passionately hate Vietnamese of any ideology, would knowingly make their

country vulnerable to American attack for the sake of sheltering a traditional enemy.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 30, 1965]
PROVING NEUTRALITY IS TASK—WAR FEARS TERRIFY CAMBODIA AS LEADER STRUGGLES FOR PEACE

(By Stanley Karnow)

HONG KONG, December 29.—The Vietnam conflict, already extended into North Vietnam and southern Laos, now appears to be approaching the edge of further expansion—into adjacent Cambodia.

The prospects terrifies Cambodians. They foresee their peaceful land transformed, like Vietnam, into a frightful battlefield. But to avoid that catastrophe, their chief of state, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, may have to perform something like a legal miracle.

Beyond press dispatches, no official evidence has been advanced to substantiate charges that Cambodia serves as a sanctuary for Vietnam's Communist troops. Nevertheless, Sihanouk is under pressure to prove that his country does not willfully or even inadvertently aid the Communists. If he fails, Cambodia could suffer the consequences.

Against such odds, Sihanouk has been desperately trying to demonstrate his innocence.

INVESTIGATIONS INVITED

Early this month he invited the Indian, Canadian and Polish delegates of the International Control Commission, created by the 1954 Geneva accords, to inspect Cambodia thoroughly.

At the same time, Sihanouk asked the Washington Post to pursue a parallel investigation. The Post said it was not equipped to investigate such a complex problem but welcomed an opportunity for a trained reporter to see for himself. As the Post's correspondent for southeast Asia, I was selected for the assignment.

From the start I realized that it would be a delicate and unenviable task—if only because the whole issue of alleged Communist sanctuaries in Cambodia has become politically loaded.

COMMENTS HEIGHTEN TENSION

For one thing, Sihanouk has prejudiced himself by heightening tensions with his provocative rhetoric. He extols Red China, proclaims his sympathy for the Vietcong, likens President Johnson to Hitler, and then expects frustrated American commanders in Vietnam to believe he is "100 percent neutral."

The issue has been further complicated by divergent attitudes within the U.S. mission in Saigon. Many diplomats, wary of the political implications of an enlarged war, are restrained in their charges against Cambodia. Thus far their views seem to have prevailed over those of their most daring military colleagues.

The region's historic rivalries also confuse and aggravate the situation. Vietnamese and Thai accusations against Cambodia, their traditional enemy, are often as fantastic as Cambodia's countercharges.

Added to these abstract complexities is the physical terrain I was invited to examine.

DIFFICULT BORDER REGION

The Cambodia-Vietnam border region comprises thousands of miles of highland jungle, lowland swamp, lofty mountains and rolling hills, much of it sparsely inhabited by primitive tribes that barely speak Cambodian.

Obviously I could not poke into every thatched hut in each forest clearing. I could not be sure that frontier guards, customs officers, provincial officials and others would speak the truth. I was not even certain that my interpreter would translate my questions faithfully.

Yet I had, from the Cambodian Government, striking evidence of cooperation—an

Alouette helicopter, tireless pilot, and total freedom to travel when and where I wished. Thus I was clearly not the victim of a gigantic conspiracy contrived to mislead me.

In Saigon, where I stopped before going to Cambodia, military and civilian officials seemed far less dogmatic in their charges against Cambodia than many press reports bearing Saigon datelines.

SUSPICION OF ARSENALS

These officials suggested that the arsenal of 7.62 millimeter Chinese Communist weapons now used by the Vietcong may have been introduced from Cambodia into South Vietnam about 2 years ago and hidden in caches until recently. Indicated that stocks of Vietcong explosives, lately uncovered in South Vietnam's delta, might have been manufactured from nitrates and other chemicals transported down the Mekong River from Cambodia.

Beyond these details, offered with some reservation, Saigon sources appeared unable, or perhaps unwilling, to extend firmer intelligence on Vietcong activities in Cambodia.

The morning of my arrival in Phnom Penh, Cambodia's capital, Sihanouk had publicly invited the ICC to keep permanent inspection teams at the port of Sihanoukville and control weapons shipments to Cambodian army barracks, headquarters and supply centers.

Western diplomats in Phnom Penh considered Sihanouk's offer a welcome gesture of good faith, but whether the ICC was equipped for the job aroused some doubt.

The Commission's dozen officials in Cambodia cannot conceivably keep watch on 30,000 Cambodian troops, much less control the country's borders. To expand the ICC effectively would require years of financial negotiations and organization.

But by the time I reached Sihanoukville, 145 miles south of Phnom Penh, three ICC colonels had manfully begun to inspect cargo manifests. The Canadian delegate struck pay dirt: The movie unit that filmed "Lord Jim" in Cambodia last year had imported a case of rifles.

Built by the French within recent years, Sihanoukville is a small port and relatively easy to examine. During November, two Chinese Communist ships had unloaded cargo there. Inside the port's single warehouse I examined the Chinese merchandise—herbs, paper, honey candy, and assorted pots and pans.

A shipment of Chinese weapons had reached Sihanoukville last spring, Cambodian port officials told me. One of them said: "Why should we give them to the Vietcong when we need them for our own soldiers?"

SMUGGLING IS COMMON

Though the coast is patrolled by United States and South Vietnamese vessels based at the Vietnamese island of Phuquoc, smuggling is common. I learned, however, that most of the contraband consists of beer, cigarettes and nylon fishing nets brought from Vietnam and Thailand and exchanged for Cambodian fish and soybeans. Authorities apparently tolerate this traffic.

I did not observe the 27,000 Chinese Communist guerrillas, alleged by Thailand's Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman to be training at Sihanoukville. Nor did I feel that the port, whatever its past, is currently on the Vietcong supply route.

At the nearby town of Kampot, however, I encountered evidence that the Vietnam border, 30 miles away, is not hermetically sealed. Within a recent 2-month period, about 20 Cambodian refugees from Vietnam were brought into the local hospital, suffering from gunshot wounds.

Conjecture in Saigon had suggested that the Kampot hospital was used by the Vietcong. The resident physician, a Paris-educated Chinese, did not know his patients'

January 17, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

323

as a result, been occasional border incursions and bombing of Cambodian territory has caused the deepest concern to the Cambodian Government. Cambodia can be expected to make the most vigorous efforts to resist becoming directly involved in the struggle surging through South Vietnam and to repel to the best of its capability direct and organized invasions of its territory which may stem from the mounting tempo of the war.

Prince Sihanouk has suggested a way to settlement of this explosive problem which should receive the most careful consideration from all concerned. He has asked for expanded observer patrols in the area under the auspices of the International Control Commission. U.S. funds would probably be necessary to carry out this suggestion. But the ultimate cost to this Nation of such a venture would be infinitesimal compared to that of expanded conflict beyond Vietnam into northeastern Cambodia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the January 5 issue of the New York Times be included at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In addition I ask that three articles by Stanley Karnow which portray the current situation in Cambodia, with emphasis on the border question, also be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 5, 1966]
THE CAMBODIAN BORDER

The authorization to American commanders in Vietnam to launch attacks into northeastern Cambodia in "self-defense" has now brought notice to the United Nations from Prince Sihanouk that if this happens he will seek foreign military assistance—presumably from Communist China—for reprisal raids.

This warning deserves to be taken seriously, much as Cambodia's ruler may hesitate to endanger his country's future independence by inviting in Chinese "volunteers." The lesson of the past 5 years in Vietnam is that every measure of escalation leads to another, each matched successively by the other side. Cambodia is not likely to be an exception.

The answer to the Cambodian problem cannot be found through wider war, but only through widening the present Vietnam peace offensive—which should continue, despite the initially negative response yesterday from Hanoi.

In giving notice to the United Nations, Prince Sihanouk renewed his proposal for expanded observer patrols by the International Control Commission, as set up under the 1954 Geneva accords. This proposal—for which the Prince asks American contributions of funds and equipment—involves monitoring arms shipments to Cambodian forces through the southern Cambodian port of Sihanoukville.

To extend this project to cover the rugged jungle terrain of northeastern Cambodia, as the United Nations Secretariat reportedly is urging, would be a task of much greater difficulty. Many hundreds of observers might be needed. But it would be well worth the cost to the United States if an effective system could be established to reduce incidents. A far larger operation than this will be necessary to police a South Vietnamese peace settlement when one is reached. The experience and training gained in Cambodia would be invaluable.

Vietcong and North Vietnamese units reportedly regrouped in northeastern Cambodia

for renewed attack during the Iadrang Valley battle in November, but this evidently was an unusual event. Repeated investigations by Western newsmen as well as by the ICC have failed to turn up proof that the Communists make major use of Cambodia either as a sanctuary or as an infiltration route for men and supplies into South Vietnam. The route through Laos is shorter and there are plenty of isolated areas in South Vietnam itself in which to cache supplies.

The limited importance of Cambodia to either side in Vietnam should make it far easier to reach a Cambodian agreement than a Vietnam settlement. Yet the use of the Geneva machinery for this purpose might help both sides ease into preliminary discussions on ending the war in Vietnam itself.

The dispute with Cambodia calls attention again to the absence of direct American contact with Phnom Penh. When Prince Sihanouk broke diplomatic relations, he indicated willingness to continue consular relations with the United States, but the State Department decided to withdraw completely. An offer to reestablish an American consulate in Phnom Penh would be an act of wise diplomacy.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Dec. 28, 1965]

TRANQUIL NATION FEARS WAR—TREK FINDS CAMBODIA NO VIETCONG HAVEN

(The writer has just returned from a 10-day trip, covering 3,000 miles through Cambodia by jeep, helicopter, and on foot. Further reports will follow.)

(By Stanley Karnow)

HONG KONG, December 27.—Reminiscent of a French prefecture, the Cambodian capital of Phnom Penh is a pleasant town of handsome villas and luxuriant gardens and people who doze through their afternoons—as if the turbulence of southeast Asia were light years away.

The peace that pervades Phnom Penh and the rest of the land is the most striking achievement of Cambodia's Chief of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk. It is an achievement he repeatedly stresses in his ceaseless stream of oratory.

In the 12 years since it won independence from France, Sihanouk asserts, Cambodia's neutrality has saved it from the fate of its neighbors.

It is not, like Laos, torn by civil strife. In contrast to Vietnam, it is not being destroyed by war. Unlike Thailand, it has not become the site of foreign bases that invite Communist subversion.

Over the years, Sihanouk has preserved peace in Cambodia by tactics so flexible as to have made him appear whimsical.

After a decade of dependence on American aid, he broke diplomatic ties with the United States last May and veered sharply toward Communist China, irritating the Soviet Union in the process. At the same time, he has strived to strengthen his bonds with France, and he is currently trying to improve his relations with Australia, Great Britain, and Japan.

Shifty as they seem, however, Sihanouk's moves have been basically motivated by a clear, consistent aim. Playing for time, he has hoped to spare his people repetition of the ruinous history that nearly reduced them to extinction. In his view, communism is a less appalling prospect.

But if Sihanouk's adroit vamping for time has thus far given Cambodia its years of calm, his time may be running out. And the capital's air of tranquility often appears betrayed by the perceptible feeling that Cambodia faces bitter days ahead.

WAR'S SPREAD FEARED

This mood of pessimism reflects the fear that the war in Vietnam may spill over Cambodia's borders.

Within recent days, American commanders in Vietnam have been advised that they have the "inherent right of self defense" to enter Cambodia in pursuit of their enemy. For months, American press dispatches have dramatized allegations that Cambodia is a base and sanctuary for Vietcong and North Vietnamese troops.

Mindful of their history, Cambodians see this growing danger as a signal that the hated Vietnamese, who invaded their land in the past, have found a new pretext for aggression.

Time and again within recent years, Sihanouk has sought to protect himself against the threat of war. Time and again he has met with disappointments.

His request 3 years ago for an international conference to guarantee his neutrality was rebuffed by the United States, reticent to acknowledge a formula applicable to South Vietnam. But later, when the idea seemed more plausible to Washington, it was rejected by Peiping.

BORDERS UNDEFINED

His efforts to define his borders with Vietnam, in talks with Saigon as well as Hanoi and Vietcong representatives, have been unsuccessful.

At the Communist-dominated "Indochinese Peoples Conference," in Cambodia last March, Sihanouk was not permitted to deliver a speech pleading for a negotiated peace in Vietnam. Instead, he had the speech printed and quietly distributed.

But while emphasizing his neutrality, Sihanouk often acts, perhaps impulsively, to undo the effect he creates, frequently leaving his most ardent admirers bewildered.

He has denied giving material aid to the Vietcong. Yet in a public ceremony here last September he affirmed his political support for them, matching his statement with a "humanitarian" gift of 40 cases of medicine.

INVITED INSPECTION

Since then he has disclosed that he is considering the sale of Cambodian rice to the Vietcong. Says his Prime Minister, Prince Norodom Kantol: "We will sell rice to whoever pays us the best price—in hard currency."

Though they strenuously deny that supply routes pass from Cambodia into the Vietcong-held areas of Vietnam, Cambodian officials decline to reveal how their gift of medicines reach the Vietcong belligerents.

With all this, however, Sihanouk is almost desperately anxious to disprove charges that Cambodia is a significant source of backing for the Vietcong. And in this effort he has displayed considerable good faith.

Earlier this month, for example, he invited the International Control Commission, composed of Indian, Canadian, and Polish delegates, to inspect as thoroughly as they wished the port of Sihanoukville, alleged to be the entry point for weapons destined for the Vietcong.

On December 13, moreover, Sihanouk authorized the Control Commission to follow weapons shipments, due to arrive from China, to Cambodian army barracks and arsenals, and to register their further movements. The Commission will also be allowed to record activities at a Chinese-built weapons repair factory south of Phnompenh.

Such freedom of movement, say Commission officials, has not been accorded elsewhere in Indochina.

LET'S IN CORRESPONDENTS

Concurrently, Sihanouk has invited selected American newspaper correspondents into Cambodia to determine whether it is being used as a Vietcong sanctuary or base. Such an invitation was extended to the New York Times in September. A similar invitation was sent to the Washington Post 3 weeks ago. I arrived on December 13, after

Senate

MONDAY, JANUARY 17, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Bishop W. Earl Ledden, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

This, too, O Lord, is a day which Thou hast made; we will rejoice and be glad in it. For though there is darkness at noon, and men and nations have lost their way, we know that we are not God forsaken. Thou art still the light of those who turn to Thee, and Thy way can still be known among men.

Thou hast sustained and delivered our beloved country in other days of darkness. Now, again, we lift our prayer with confidence: God bless America.

Guide us through the darkness of our day. Deliver us, we pray, from the dangers that beset us. Enable us to communicate to the wide world our sincere desire for a prosperity shared by all mankind.

Because our hope is in Thee, Our Fathers' God, we are not despairing. We are confident that a better way than we have ever known may yet be found by Thy guidance.

To this end grant to every Senator, this day, the light of Thy presence. Bless and strengthen every attitude expressed in support of that righteousness which exalteth a nation, every effort put forth to extend the reach of that aggressive good will that may yet find the way to an honorable and lasting peace. In His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 14, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

REPORT ON FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from

the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Annual Report on the Foreign Assistance Program of the United States for fiscal year 1965, which I here transmit, shows what Americans have done during the past 12 months to help other people help themselves.

The record of these months offers new testimony to our continuing conviction that our own peace and prosperity here at home depends on continued progress toward a better life for people everywhere.

In pursuit of that goal, we have, during this past year, placed new emphasis on the basic problem of securing more food for the world's population.

We have agreed to extend technical assistance to countries asking for help on population programs. At the same time, our overseas missions have been directed to give priority to projects for achieving better agriculture. Additional resources of our great universities have been applied to rural development efforts abroad, and we have moved to increase the nutritional value of food shipped overseas for children.

During these past 12 months we have also:

Begun to make education a more vital part of our assistance to other nations. Today, 70 American universities are engaged in the development of 39 Asian, African, and Latin American countries through this program.

Given our full support to development of a new life for the people of southeast Asia through a regional development program—a true and hopeful alternative to profitless aggression. We have made progress toward the establishment of an Asian Development Bank, and accelerated plans for development of the critical Mekong River Basin.

The 12 months covered by this report also reflect our progress toward making our aid programs both more realistic, and more efficient. For example:

Foreign assistance has become a smaller factor in our balance of payments. In fiscal year 1965, more than 80 cents of every AID dollar was spent for the purchase of American goods and services. American products and skills went overseas as aid; most of the dollars which paid for them stayed in this country.

Foreign aid has become a smaller burden on our resources. The \$3.5 billion committed for military and economic assistance in fiscal year 1965 represented 3.5 percent of the Federal budget and one-half of 1 percent of the U.S. gross national product.

At the height of the Marshall plan, in comparison, foreign aid accounted for more than 11 percent of the Federal budget and nearly 2 percent of our gross national product.

Perhaps the most important single change in our AID programs has been the shift from simply helping other countries stay afloat to helping them become self-supporting, so that our assistance will no longer be needed.

Three-fourths of our AID program in fiscal year 1965 was devoted to development assistance: programs of technical and capital assistance in agriculture, industry, health and education that strengthen the ability of other nations to use their own resources.

Finally, private participation in AID programs is at an alltime high. Through contracts with American universities, business firms, labor unions, cooperatives, and other private groups, AID has sharply increased the involvement of nongovernmental resources in international development.

Two of every five AID-financed technicians in the field today are not Federal employees, but experts from private American institutions.

There is much in the less-developed world that causes us deep concern today: enmity between neighbor nations that threatens the hard-won gains of years of development effort; reluctance to move rapidly on needed internal reforms; political unrest that delays constructive programs to help the people; an uncertain race between food supplies and population.

We are right to be concerned for the present. But we are also right to be hopeful for the future. In this report are recorded some of the solid, human achievements on which our future hopes are based.

Whether it provides strength for threatened peoples like those in southeast Asia, or support for the self-help of millions on the move in Latin America, in Africa, in the Near East and South Asia, our foreign assistance program remains an investment of critical and promising importance to our own national future.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

JANUARY 17, 1966.

WAIVER OF CALL OF CALENDAR UNDER RULE VIII

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar under rule VIII, for the consideration of unobjected-to measures be waived.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

MONTANA PIONEER DIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, during the final days of 1965, I was saddened to learn of the death of one of Montana's pioneers and finest citizens. The passing of Tom Stout brought to a close a most colorful and accomplished career.

Tom Stout was a politician, editor, and publisher in the finest tradition. He was active in Democratic politics and served the State of Montana in the House of Representatives for two terms. Interestingly, he was sworn in standing between Sam Rayburn and John Nance Garner. The vast majority of Tom Stout's life was devoted to journalism. He started as a reporter and then became editor and publisher of the Fergus County Democrat in Lewistown. In his later years, he was editorial writer for the Billings Gazette.

Tom Stout has a long and full life, one to which we can all aspire. He was a good friend and one who will be missed. Mr. President, I ask that two editorials and a news story be printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Great Falls Tribune, Dec. 29, 1965]

WE HONOR THOMAS H. (TOM) STOUT

In 1902, a 22-year-old ex-teacher who had just been admitted to practice law in Missouri, asked a railway agent at Hannibal, Mo., how far he could get for \$25.

The homesteaders' rail fare to Billings happened to be \$21.85 so Thomas H. (Tom) Stout arrived in Billings on Easter Sunday of 1902.

Tom Stout made many contributions to Montana before he died at Billings Sunday night. He served two terms in Congress, several terms in the Montana Senate and also the House of Representatives and was a member of the Montana Railroad and Public Service Commission. He also was a distinguished newspaper publisher, a prominent Democrat and a Montana historian.

While he was a State senator in 1913, Stout introduced a resolution which paved the way for women to get the right to vote in Montana.

Above all, Tom Stout was a charming, witty, and gracious Montanan.

[From the Lewistown Democrat News, Dec. 28, 1965]

TOM STOUT, FAREWELL

The death of Tom Stout marks the end of a brilliant career of a man who called Lewistown home for 45 years but was acclaimed all over Montana for his achievements in newspaper, political, and literary fields.

Titled as one of the founders of this newspaper, he was known and loved by the residents of this area who appreciated his warm, genuine style of writing and his friendly, gentle manner.

Above all else, Tom Stout was acclaimed for his outstanding editorials. While he was never one to shy away from taking a stand and was noted for the many issues for which he crusaded, still he was always fair and his

editorials reflected his own qualities of kindness and consideration for others.

Described by one of his many friends as a highly intellectual student, Tom Stout is also remembered for his three-volume "History of Montana," standard equipment in newspaper offices for almost half a century.

Not only was he acclaimed for his accomplishments in the newspaper world, but Tom Stout was also active in politics and served in both the State legislature and the U.S. Congress, as well as on the Montana Railroad and Public Service Commission.

Words are ineffectual to describe the contribution made by Tom Stout to this newspaper, this community, and the State of Montana. Suffice it to say he will be sadly missed by all those who cherished his friendship and by the wider circle of those who admired and enjoyed the fruits of his talents.

[From the Lewistown Democrat News, Dec. 28, 1965]

TOM STOUT, EARLY-DAY PUBLISHER AND EDITOR, DIES IN BILLINGS SUNDAY

Tom Stout, 86, founder of this newspaper, and one of central Montana's most prominent figures for half a century, died Sunday in Billings. Funeral services have been set for Wednesday at 2:30 p.m. at the Settergen-Carey Funeral Home in Billings.

Stout first came to Lewistown in November 1902, to accept a job as a reporter on John Vrooman's newspaper, the Fergus County Argus. In 1904 he and Harry J. Kelly started the Fergus County Democrat, later buying the Lewistown Democrat News.

Stout was especially well known throughout the State for his excellent editorials. He served as editor and publisher of the Lewistown Democrat News until he sold the paper in 1946. During the 1947-60 he wrote editorials for the Billings Gazette.

Active in Democratic politics from the time he came to Montana, Stout was elected State senator from Fergus County in 1911 and again in 1913. He resigned as State senator in 1913 to become Representative at Large in the U.S. Congress. He was sworn in standing between Sam Rayburn and John Nance Garner, both of whom were also starting their term in the Legislature. He was reelected to another term at the next election, but did not seek reelection in 1916, and returned to the newspaper in Lewistown.

In 1930 he was elected to the Montana Railroad and Public Service Commission. He was a candidate to the Democratic national convention in 1908 and to all State conventions from 1904 to 1946.

Stout was elected a Fergus County State representative in 1942 and was reelected in 1944 and 1946.

Not only prominent for his achievements in the newspaper field and politics, Stout also gained recognition as a writer with his three-volume "History of Montana" published in 1922. The history was considered standard equipment in newspaper offices all over the State.

Stout was one of 13 charter members of the Lewistown Rotary organized in 1916 and served as its first president. When he left Lewistown he continued as an honorary member of the Lewistown organization until the time of his death.

Tom Stout was born May 20, 1879, at New London, Mo., a son of Mr. and Mrs. Jacob E. Stout. He received his formal education at Warrensburg State Normal School and the University of Missouri at Columbia. He studied law and was admitted to the Missouri bar in 1901 and to the Montana bar in 1913, but never practiced.

In 1904 he married Leah Wunderlin of Lewistown, who preceded him in death.

He married Sibyl Sherlock in Helena on August 12, 1936. Besides the widow, he is survived by a son, Coleman Stout, city editor of the Current-Argus at Carlsbad, N. Mex.;

two daughters, Mrs. Maxine Vincent of Boston and Mrs. Barbara Shloss of Levittown, N.Y.; two step daughters, Mrs. Edward Rech of Greybull, Wyo., and Mrs. Lawrence Knopp of Utrecht, Holland; eight grandchildren and three great-grandchildren.

The Rev. Jess McGuire will officiate at the funeral service with burial following in Mountview Cemetery.

Active pallbearers will be Glen Carney, J. Strand Hilleboe, Harold Seipp, Ross Bowman, Wilbur Pique, and William Buckley.

Honorary pallbearers include former Senator Burton K. Wheeler, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, W. C. Rae, J. H. Dickey, Jr., Harry E. Lay, Earl McGinnis, Dan Whetstone, J. Rusty Larcombe, A. E. Wilkinson, E. K. Cheadle, Joe Montgomery, William Schmidlapp, Erwin Judd, and A. S. d'Autremont.

THE DANGEROUS SITUATION ALONG THE VIETNAMESE-CAMBODIAN BORDER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a recent editorial in the New York Times which refers to the highly dangerous situation along the Vietnamese-Cambodian border. It discusses the threat by Cambodian Prince Sihanouk to ask for foreign help—presumably from Communist China—if American commanders launch attacks into the northeastern part of his country. The editorial states:

The answer to the Cambodian problem cannot be found through wider war, but only through widening the present Vietnamese peace offensive.

This problem is touched on in the report to the Senate by Senators ARKEN, MUSKIE, INOUYE, BOGGS and myself which was made after our recent tour of southeast Asia. The report states the following:

Cambodia, in a different manner and to a much lesser extent than Laos, is already directly touched by the fighting in Vietnam. There are repeated charges that Cambodian territory is being used as a base for Vietcong operations. That is possible in view of the remoteness and obscurity of the border but there is no firm evidence of any such organized usage and no evidence whatsoever that any alleged usage of Cambodian soil is with the sanction, much less the assistance, of the Cambodian Government. Prince Sihanouk responded immediately to a recent allegation that the Cambodian port of Sihanoukville is being used to transship supplies to the Vietcong by calling for an investigation by the International Control Commission which was set up under the Geneva Accords of 1954.

Cambodia's overwhelming concern is the preservation of its national integrity which, in times past, has been repeatedly violated by more powerful neighbors and is still subject to occasional forays from a minor dissident movement (the Khmer Serei) which has been allowed to base itself in the neighboring nations. Cambodia seeks recognition and respect of its borders by all parties to the conflict. It asks to be left to live in peace so that it may concentrate on its own problems and internal development. The Cambodians have made great internal progress, largely through their own efforts supplemented by a judicious use of aid from the United States in the past and from other nations both in the past and at the present time. They have a peaceful and productive nation with an intense sense of national unity and loyalty to Prince Sihanouk.

The fact that fighting in South Vietnam has raged close to the border and there have,

January 17, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

341

which is the situation today. He will have direct control over the new Assistant Secretary for the Federal Housing Administration—a post that replaces that of FHA Commissioner, over whom he now has little statutory authority—and he can do whatever he likes with the Community Facilities Administration, the Urban Renewal Administration, and the Public Housing Administration.

Secondly, the act creating the Department suggests, rather vaguely, that the new Secretary of H.U.D.—now known as “HUD” in Washington parlance—do what he can to coordinate the efforts of other agencies, including his own, to keep the cities from falling into complete chaos. Thus the post of “urban coordinator” will be important. This post was established in the act to help pull together Federal urban programs into one, smoothly orchestrated operation.

So the new Secretary will have some important powers, whatever Mr. Johnson does with the task force recommendations. But there is one fly in the ointment. If the Secretary acquires no new functions other than the housing function over which he has ruled since 1961, then his power will depend on his ability to make other Government agencies with urban programs coordinate. And this, in turn, will depend on whether or not the President supports him.

This issue, too, is in doubt. Mr. Johnson kept Mr. Weaver hanging for 4 months while he searched for somebody else to head the Department. Mr. Weaver is a very good man, but the President's long talent hunt suggested that the White House felt there was somebody, somewhere, who was better.

POWERS

Then, too, Mr. Weaver had managed to anger many powerful special interest groups in the urban field, although it is hard to contemplate a housing administrator who would not. The mayors, for example, complained that they could not get the necessary funds for urban renewal, and that the processing of their urban renewal plans got caught up in all kinds of unnecessary redtape.

The upshot of all this is that Mr. Weaver—who turned down several excellent offers while waiting for the President to make up his mind—comes to his new post under rather unfavorable auspices.

With the President's support he can be an excellent administrator, an innovator, and a salesman with Congress. He can transform a housing agency into a creative and powerful force in American life. Without the President's support, he may end up being just another housing administrator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I believe it appropriate to point out that we have heard discussions of discrimination in the consideration of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Civil Rights Act of 1965. It is worth noting that the Senate discriminated in favor of Mr. Weaver.

The Senate came to the unanimous conclusion that the nomination should be considered without lying over for 1 day as the rules require. A single objection, of course, would have delayed the nomination.

The reason that the Senate saw fit to act in this regard as to Robert C. Weaver is that he has performed well in his present position many functions he will have as a member of the President's Cabinet. He performed those functions.

I have heard no charge or suggestion that he would do anything other than his duty as the merciful God permits him to do that duty and to see the facts as they come before him.

On that basis, just as the Senate gave its consent that the nomination be considered, I urge that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ROBERT C. WOOD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert C. Wood to be Undersecretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to morning hour business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MANSFIELD-AIKEN MISSION REPORT

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, an excellent article has been written on the Mansfield-Aiken mission and on the report of that extremely important and carefully selected “blue ribbon” senatorial group. It is an article by Vic Maerki in the January 10, 1966 issue of the Burlington Free Press. Mr. Maerki knows whereof he speaks because he is no stranger to the Washington scene as he has delved deeply into the legislative operations of our Federal Government from both the aspect of a working member of the press and a hard working legislative staff assistant.

He accords to the Mansfield-Aiken mission and its report the seriousness, dignity and recognition it so richly merits. I call the attention of the Senate particularly to the last paragraph of his article in which he states:

Whether the conclusions by these two distinguished national leaders are valid or not, they have done the United States a service by voicing their opinions on the eve of the opening of a session of the Congress that will surely be the forum for a widening—and perhaps, climactic—national dialog on the subject.

To this I would add my own personal comment that whether one agrees with the findings, conclusions and opinions expressed in the Mansfield-Aiken mission report or subscribes to their position, it must be recognized that this is the deadly serious work of respected, eminently capable and dedicated national leaders.

I ask unanimous consent that the Maerki article be placed in the RECORD at this point and invite the attention of all Senators to it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONCE OVER LIGHTLY
(By Vic Maerki)

In the 74th year of a life that has spanned two world wars and a series of smaller conflicts, U.S. Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, is trying his hardest to help his country prevent world war III.

To that end, the wise old Vermonter has joined in a grim report to President Johnson that warns the only alternative to a general war in Asia may be an unpopular and unsatisfactory negotiated settlement of the conflict in Vietnam.

It has become apparent in recent days that AIKEN has become convinced that the United States will have to strike some painful bargain in Vietnam to reduce the danger of that war spreading into a world conflict.

The grim substance of AIKEN's feelings have already been made public by U.S. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, the Senate majority leader.

AIKEN was one of four Senators who accompanied MANSFIELD on a world mission whose major purpose was to compile facts on the war in Vietnam and on the world attitude toward the war.

The formal report of the MANSFIELD mission was made public this week, but the Nation and the world have had little word on the private, oral report MANSFIELD gave the President on December 19, the day after the five Senators returned to this country.

But AIKEN and others close to MANSFIELD have suggested the Senator majority leader's report to the President was even grimmer than the formal report, if that is possible.

The evidence is that MANSFIELD told the President that there is very little hope that the United States will be able to negotiate the kind of settlement in Vietnam that all Americans are hoping for.

AIKEN has already suggested that he and MANSFIELD feel the best the United States can hope for is a kind of settlement that will provide a limited type of “peace” in South Vietnam.

MANSFIELD and AIKEN appear to agree that that prompt efforts by the United States might lead to a negotiated settlement of the widening conflict between the United States and regular North Vietnamese troops who take their orders from Hanoi.

At the same time, the two Senate leaders are making it clear that they feel that kind of settlement would do little, if anything, to end the war of terror being waged against the South Vietnamese Government by the Vietcong guerrillas.

That suggestion, of course, is not the kind of proposal that either President Johnson or his key advisers want to make to this Nation or to the world. It is not the kind of “peace” that Americans—including MANSFIELD and AIKEN—want to accept.

But, AIKEN and MANSFIELD have—in the strongest possible terms—warned the President that the United States is nearing the point of no return to Vietnam, a point at which the alternative to an unsatisfactory negotiated settlement may be a general war in Asia.

AIKEN has made it clear to friends that he has given his unqualified support to all the private recommendations MANSFIELD has given to the President, and Johnson is aware of that support.

There have also been growing indications that the Mansfield report to President Johnson on December 19 may have contributed substantially to Johnson's decision to sus-

pend the bombing raids against North Vietnam.

AIKEN and MANSFIELD are old friends. AIKEN and Johnson are old friends and the President, at AIKEN's birthday party last year, called the Vermont Senator "a great American" and a colleague whose wisdom and counsel he valued highly.

Neither MANSFIELD or AIKEN have taken an extreme position in the Vietnam dilemma. Unlike some of the other leaders in Washington, MANSFIELD and AIKEN have not pretended their suggestions can guarantee a solution to the struggle in southeast Asia.

MANSFIELD and AIKEN have been in the center of the moderate position in the Vietnam debate, and their major contribution to that debate so far has been to make it clear that there can be no simple solution to the complex problem.

Neither MANSFIELD or AIKEN is willing to sacrifice the honor of the United States in Asia, and they have made it clear despite the suggestions of some of their critics to the contrary.

But, they have warned that insistence on unconditional surrender in Vietnam is not consistent with the facts they found unless the United States is prepared to risk general war in Asia.

In short, AIKEN and his old friend MANSFIELD are arguing that this Nation should face the prospect that there can be no clear, simple solution to a dirty, complicated situation.

Whether the conclusions by these two distinguished national leaders are valid or not, they have done the United States a service by voicing their opinions on the eve of the opening of a session of the Congress that will surely be the forum for a widening—and perhaps, climatic—national dialog on the subject.

PEACE OFFENSIVE IN VIETNAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, all of us must continue to hope and pray that the peace offensive for Vietnam, instituted by the President, will be successful. My concern today is over what appears to be a difference of opinion at lower levels in the administration as to what the United States should do in the event the current effort to stop the killing and to begin the talking around the conference table, should be unsuccessful.

In this connection, I believe an extremely important editorial, entitled "After the Pause," was published in the Washington Post yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial may be printed at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this editorial expresses in large part my own view, to the effect that we should avoid, at almost any cost, continuing an escalation of the war; that if we are unable to persuade Hanoi and perhaps Peiping to come to the conference table or, in the alternative, gradually to ease off their attacks, we should hole up in the major cities; that our policy should be not to escalate, but to defend the strongholds. In my opinion, that is a far wiser plan than the one which is reported on the first page of the New York Times this morning, under the headline "United States Is Reported To Set Deadline for Peace Drive. Washington's View Growing Pessimistic in Absence of Reply From

Hanoi. Limit Put Near January 24. Bombing of North Vietnam Might Resume at Closing of Lunar New Year."

The source of this statement is anonymous. I do not know where this statement originated, but I hope it is not true. I strongly support the President in his efforts to get to the conference table, and in his efforts to keep the war in Vietnam from accelerating into world war III.

Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks an excellent column along these lines, entitled "L.B.J.: Searching Out of the Trap," written by Marquis Childs, and published in the Washington Post of January 17.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD. (See exhibit 2.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I further call the attention of Senators and to readers of the RECORD generally to an excellent statement by Gen. James M. Gavin, which was published in the newspapers this morning, during the course of which he said:

To increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi—or even Peiping—will add to our problems rather than detract from them, and it will not stop the penetrations of North Vietnam troops into the South.

Further, the article reads:

Gavin said the 190,000 U.S. troops already in the Vietnam theater would suffice "if we should maintain enclaves on the coast, desist in our bombing attacks on North Vietnam, and seek to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete statement published in the Washington Post this morning, summarizing General Gavin's letter to Harper's magazine, may be printed at the end of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD. (See exhibit 3.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With out objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. I am not of the view, as expressed in the Post editorial, that a large majority of the Members of Congress are in favor of starting to bomb North Vietnam, or to destroy Hanoi, or to attack the Chinese nuclear capability wherever it may be found. I am of the view that there is a majority in Congress who are behind the President in his commonsense efforts to find peace in Vietnam. I hope that this expression of my view may persuade other Members of the Senate who feel as I do to speak up for commonsense and for peace.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Sunday, Jan. 16, 1966]

AFTER THE PAUSE

The President very wisely has put no terminal date on his peace offensive or on the pause in air operations against the north while the peace efforts go forward. Since there has been no known response from Hanoi, either affirmative or negative, it is too early to say whether there will be any re-

sults. Sooner or later, if there are no negotiations at all, consideration will have to be given to the next military moves.

There is a powerful impulse in the Congress, in the country, and in some places in the executive department, for a resumption of air activity and for an initiation of full-scale warfare against the north to put a speedy end to a disagreeable war. Powerful as this impulse is, and strong as the support may be for the use of more military muscle, it is to be hoped that the President will reject the counsels of those who wish to escalate the war. There is not much reason to believe that an unlimited air war would achieve decisive results. North Vietnam does not present the kind of industrial targets that are peculiarly vulnerable to mass bombing. Even if the United States were indifferent to the moral arguments against mass bombing (and it is not indifferent), the practical results probably would not be any more decisive than were the results of area bombing in World War II. While stepped-up interdiction of communications might further diminish the ability of North Vietnam to give logistic support to a conventional military invasion, there is not much hope that it would stop infiltration of troops in small units. And even if the bombing succeeded in all these counts, the Chinese Communist support of North Vietnam might make the results indecisive. As long as air operations are directed at North Vietnam (and not China), we are embarked upon the task of kicking the cart until the horse cries for mercy.

The unconditional withdrawal of U.S. forces is a course for which there is little responsible support in the country. And the primary reason is that no one can give any assurance that this policy would be any more successful as a means of ending the war in southeast Asia than the policy of escalating the conflict. Escalation might simply move the war to another and larger theater. Withdrawal also would be likely to move the conflict to another theater in another country.

To continue or expand the present offensive against the Vietcong in the south, by the employment of the tactics now being pursued, is going to involve a heavier commitment than we have so far made if it is to have any reasonable prospect for success. Such an expanding commitment, accompanied by rising commitments of North Vietnam and China and Russia, might easily produce another stalemate at a higher level.

The facts of the situation seem to argue strongly for a somewhat different application of the military power we feel we can appropriately commit to the area. No doubt it is an alternative that already has been explored—and perhaps even rejected. But it can be argued quite persuasively that in the next phase of the war, the United States and its allies might wisely alter the character of the war in the direction of a more economical and efficient deployment. At present, we are engaged in an offensive-defense, employing both ground and air forces in the hot pursuit of Vietcong elements into terrain offering the greatest advantages of concealment and the most serious hazards to pursuing forces. To seek out and destroy a guerrilla force by such tactics, overwhelming force is required on a ratio of at least 10 to 1. The present ratio, counting all South Vietnam and American and allied forces is 826,000 to 230,000 according to the Mansfield report—and the rate of North Vietnam infiltration is on the order of 1,500 a month. So the possibility or feasibility of achieving antiguerrilla ratios like those in Malaysia and the Philippines is remote.

If it is difficult or impossible for us to annihilate the Vietcong without a military investment that looks excessive, it can be made impossible for the Vietcong to achieve their objectives without a deployment beyond

January 17, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

343

their means. Were our tactics to alter from pursuit to a take-and-hold basis, the burden for the offensive could be shifted to the Vietcong. It is our purpose to deny North Vietnam the fruits of a war of "national liberation," and we can do that by successfully holding the areas now occupied and slowly and persistently enlarging them by territorial sweeps instead of jungle pursuit. The American and South Vietnam forces, while steadily expanding the occupied areas and pushing out their defense perimeters, would be chiefly engaged in garrison operations. These, of course, are wasteful in terms of manpower employed but economical in terms of manpower expended. They are less hazardous and more feasible for a country in command of air power and thus able to maintain communications with scattered garrisons than they were for the French. Within the areas occupied by the South Vietnamese and by our forces, a program of rehabilitation and reconstruction could be pushed forward, once it becomes possible to afford the peasants and villagers security.

The military priorities under such a strategy, would be (1) securing of areas already held, (2) expansion of that territory only as rapidly as we are prepared to take and hold new real estate, (3) pursuit operations only where they can be carried out with greatest economy of force, (4) air operations chiefly in close support of territorial enlargement, and, as indicated, against large and vulnerable enemy concentrations, (5) air interdiction of routes from the north, scaled to the degree of infiltration, (6) no air attack on North Vietnam for the time being or unless surveillance discloses massing for offensive operations against the south.

This is no quick and easy formula for an offensive military success in conventional military terms. It contemplates neither the annihilation of enemy forces, the crushing of the enemy's will to resist, or the solid gains of invasion and quick occupation. It projects the steady, slow, and patient pacification and reconstruction of South Vietnam. It must be acknowledged that success will consist of denying the victory of the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong in all the territory we are prepared to take and hold and then rebuilding that occupied area and providing the inhabitants with a higher standard of living. The forces required will be quite large; but the losses in combat should be much smaller with the defending forces enjoying the advantages of well-equipped men in strong defensive positions. It will cost more money but it should cost fewer lives. It will take more time—but we should not be in a hurry.

Away from the combat areas, the strategy has the virtue of making it clear to the world that our role is purely defensive. The war in South Vietnam will come to a stop if the forces of the National Liberation Front quit their attacks. Every dispatch from the war areas will make it plain that it is the Communists who are responsible for loss of life and destruction of property. In the absence of negotiated peace there can be, under this formula, a tacit peace, whenever the Vietcong wish it.

This is no blueprint for either victory or peace in a hurry. But it is a blueprint that involves the surrender of no principle; it makes possible the de-escalation of the conflict; it contemplates the confinement of the war to the area now involved. It does not have the simplicity of victory or surrender. It plainly looks forward to an admittedly remote date when enough of the territory of South Vietnam will be secure so that there can be normal elections under which the people can pick a government of their own choice—and decide for themselves whether they wish to affiliate with North Vietnam or retain their independence.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 17, 1966]

L.B.J.: SEARCHING OUT OF THE TRAP

(By Marquis Childs)

As cruel a choice as any President ever faced—that is the prospect for Lyndon Johnson at the start of the second year of his first full term as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief. In any objective view of where we stand today the President is seen, in fact, to have no choice.

The guns-versus-butter argument is almost wholly meaningless. It implies that by trimming off a little fat the Nation can devote itself to winning the war in Vietnam. As Chief Executive, Mr. Johnson knows how false this is.

He had had on his desk for some time a report still classified secret showing 21 "high tension" cities where there is steady deterioration in the Negro ghettos. To ignore this and postpone or abandon the programs for making at least a start at correcting a century of injustice is to risk disaster. Violence and rioting on the scale of Watts could break out in any one of these cities in coming months.

But as Commander in Chief he has come to understand the nature of the trap that is Vietnam. This was the great service performed by his own chief inspector, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, the Senate's majority leader. When Senator MANSFIELD and his four colleagues returned from the round-the-world trip on which the President had sent them he made clear without any sugar-coating the consequences of an open-ended land war in Asia.

The Mansfield report is believed to have been the most important factor in the commonsense decision the President has for the time being arrived at. That is to make Vietnam a holding operation while a new and revitalized attempt is underwritten to win the villages and pacify the areas held by the South Vietnamese with American help.

This comes belatedly after the tragic errors of the past have been compounded. The so-called hamlet program was little more than a system of armed stockades within which helpless villagers were confined often at the mercy of returning Vietcong. The new program is inspired by Maj. Gen. Edward C. Lansdale, consistent advocate of the vital need to win the allegiance of the Vietnamese people.

Part of the new program is to try to broaden the base of the government in Saigon. It is today hardly more than a shadow government with Premier Nguyen Cao Ky representing a dominant military faction. The critics of negotiation make a powerful point when they say that any agreement to end the war would almost inevitably result in a takeover by the Communists in South Vietnam in a relatively short time. But the more the government slips into the role of American puppet the less likely it is that any independent regime can ever be established, with South Vietnam becoming an American protectorate into the indefinite future.

As head of his political party, the third horse he must ride in a race with odds that the Founding Fathers could hardly have conceived, the President understandably did not show his entire hand. And it is here in the weeks just ahead that the testing will come. For a large part of the military, conspicuously the Air Force, and their spokesmen will fight what appears to be a holding operation looking to an eventual settlement. Balked of their goal their shrill cries promise to become hysterical.

That goal is in one disguise or another a preventive war against Communist China. Their case sounds very much like the argument for a preventive war against the Soviet Union in the late 1940's.

As politician, compelled to tailor his decision to clients covering the entire spectrum, the President runs his greatest risks in the year ahead. Trying to please everyone—to keep his consensus—he will end by pleasing no one. Merely cutting up the conventional pie, in deference to the threat of inflation, will not be enough if the cities are really to be made over. Holding the line may prove militarily impossible and if the Communist enemy gives him no quarter, in response to all his efforts to find an honorable way out, he will have to take the steps toward escalation and the prospect of a greatly enlarged war that he so dreads.

To ridicule the President's peace offensive is easy enough. The conventional diplomat shudders in distaste. But there is increasing evidence that it has had a marked effect in both the allied and nonaligned worlds, and no one can say what may be the results behind the Communist barriers. Here is a man determined to find his way out of the trap who will not stand on the conventional wisdom.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 17, 1966]

GAVIN SAYS HANOI BOMBING COULD BRING IN PEIPING UNITS

NEW YORK, January 16—Gen. James M. Gavin declared today a massive buildup of U.S. forces in Vietnam may prompt Red China to send troops there and reopen the Korean war as well.

The 58-year-old former chief of U.S. Army research and development suggested that America concentrate instead on holding major bases along the South Vietnam coast while diplomats seek an end to the fighting.

In a letter appearing in the February issue of Harper's magazine, Gavin said:

"To increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi—or even Peiping—will add to our problems rather than detract from them, and it will not stop the penetrations of North Vietnam troops into the south.

"Also, if we were to quadruple, for example, our combat forces there, we should then anticipate the intervention of Chinese 'volunteers' and the reopening of the Korean front.

"ESCALATION SEEN LIKELY

"This seems to be the ultimate prospect of the course that we are now on."

Gavin said the 190,000 U.S. troops already in the Vietnam theater would suffice "if we should maintain enclaves on the coast, desist in our bombing attacks on North Vietnam, and seek to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva."

He asserted that an attempt to make all of South Vietnam secure from the Communists "would take many times as much force as we now have in Vietnam"—and risk a fresh outbreak of Red Chinese aggression in the Korean pattern.

"I do not for a moment think that if we should withdraw from Vietnam the next stop would be Waikiki," Gavin said. "The Kra Peninsula, Thailand, and the Philippines can all be secured, although we ultimately might have heavy fighting on the northern frontiers of Thailand."

Emphasizing that he spoke "solely from a military-technical point of view," Gavin recalled that he was Chief of U.S. Army Plans and Operations at the time of the French military disaster in Dienbienphu.

He said Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, then Chief of Staff, "directed that we go into the situation quite thoroughly in case a decision should be made to send U.S. forces into the Hanoi Delta."

"The more we studied the situation," Gavin wrote, "the more we realized that we were, in fact, considering going to war with China, since she was supplying all the arms, ammunition, medical, and other supplies to Ho Chi Minh."

"If we would be, in fact, fighting China, then we were fighting her in the wrong place on terms entirely to her advantage."

Gavin said southeast Asia is no place to take on Red China in military combat.

"Manchuria, with its vast industrial complex, coal and iron ore, is the Ruhr of China and the heart of its warmaking capacity," he said. "There, rather than in southeast Asia, is where China should be engaged, if at all."

SHOWDOWN NOT YET DUE

Gavin added that if Red China continues aggression and arms itself with nuclear weapons "the time may come when China will bring upon herself a nuclear war. But that time is not here yet."

Gavin, a paratroop commander in World War II, retired from the Army in 1958 because of differences with the Eisenhower administration over modernizing the Armed Forces. He was a particularly strong exponent of more aerial mobility for ground troops.

Gavin called the sky cavalry concept, which we are now employing in South Vietnam, and commented:

"When I retired in 1958, I said that I would be happy to serve as a private in the Army if it were the kind of an army that I wanted it to be.

"I think it is that kind of an army now * * *."

INTENTION OF SENATOR JAVITS TO REPORT TO SENATE ON HIS VISIT TO VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have just returned from Vietnam and intend in due course to report to the Senate thereon. Therefore, I shall not make any statement on that subject on the Senate floor today.

REPEAL OF NONCOMMUNIST AFFIDAVIT REQUIREMENT FROM MEDICARE AMENDMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the repeal of the non-Communist affidavit required by Public Law 89-97, the so-called medicare amendments to the Social Security Act. I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for 1 week for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 2776) to amend the Social Security Amendments of 1965 so as to eliminate therefrom certain provisions which deny hospital insurance benefits to certain individuals otherwise eligible therefor because of their membership in certain subversive organizations or their prior conviction of crimes involving subversive activities, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRksen] was kind enough during my absence in Vietnam to announce at the opening of the Senate last Monday that I would introduce this bill, as I had an-

nounced during the adjournment of Congress I would do.

As one of the early sponsors of the legislation to provide medical insurance to older Americans, and as the author of that section of the act which blankets in all citizens who are over 65, whether or not they are social security beneficiaries, I am particularly concerned that the new law contains a provision disqualifying additional participants from medical benefits if they have belonged to certain organizations. It will be remembered that many of us on the Republican side of the aisle including the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the former Senator from New York, Mr. Keating, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], spoke emphatically in favor of the whole program for medical care.

Thus, I am particularly concerned that the very persons whom we worked so hard to include will be disqualified unless the requirement for this particular kind of affidavit shall be removed. The section objected to—and quite properly so—does not affect 14 million Americans covered by social security, but only the 2 million who are not otherwise beneficiaries of the system.

Mr. President, I know a good deal about this subject; that is why I am introducing the bill and making a statement today. At the time the original medicare proposals were drafted—and I was one of the draftsmen—this kind of disqualification was contained in other Federal statutes—specifically, the National Defense Education Act and the National Science Foundation Act—and was apparently included in the medical care bill solely as "boiler plate" language in the course of its drafting. It was not discussed on the floor of the Senate; it was not discussed in committee.

Recent changes in both National Defense Education Act and the National Science Foundation Act, however, clearly indicate that congressional sentiment is against such oaths.

It is my personal belief that Congress did not intend, in passing the medicare bill, to incorporate such a provision in the language of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from New York is offering an amendment to the act that seeks to—

Mr. JAVITS. To excise that language.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from New York honor me by permitting me to be joined as a cosponsor of his proposal?

Mr. JAVITS. I would be honored.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from New York is quite correct. We were not aware that that language would be a part of the bill. After all, we probably

should have had knowledge, but we did not have knowledge of it because most of us were busy with other matters. Its inclusion in the Act came as a complete surprise to be to understand that, in fact, it had found its way into the bill at a level other than the floor of the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. I may tell the Senator from Oregon that I, as one of the bill's draftsmen, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and other Senators who participated were as much surprised. The bill was long and complicated. I thought I had read every word of it, but apparently I had not, and the language crept in because other Acts were being used as models. The language should be excised as quickly as possible, because Americans over 65 should not be denied the medical benefits available under the act because of past associations. Nor should the 2 million Americans affected by this provision be subject to a loyalty oath to establish eligibility.

As I pointed out during the debate on the National Defense Education Act amendment, no farmer is asked to sign a loyalty oath to obtain a crop subsidy; no small businessman is asked to sign a loyalty oath when he seeks financial help from the Government; and the officers of no shipline are asked to sign such an oath when they seek a ship subsidy.

I urge other Senators to join me in cosponsorship so that this last vestige of the demeaning test oath will be removed from our statute books.

I am grateful to my colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] who honors me and this endeavor by joining me as a cosponsor.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONROYA in the chair). The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, confronting the Senate in a few weeks will be a question of the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I know that before that question comes to the floor there will be much discussion of it. There has been already. As is so often the case when division is deep and feelings are strong, some of the statements are something less than helpful.

I found it very helpful to read an article by Prof. Leroy S. Merrifield in the George Washington University magazine.

Here is an academician of distinction and one who is experienced in labor-management relations speaking his point of view with relation to this question. As is not surprising, since I share his point of view, I think it is an excellent article. I believe that even those who do not see it the way we do will recognize that Professor Merrifield furnishes a balance which is sometimes lacking in our debates. Because it is a matter of concern to all of us, and because I believe the article is very worthwhile, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "The Union Shop and the National Labor Policy," written by Prof. Leroy S. Merrifield, and published in the George

January 17, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

357

GENERAL GAVIN WARNS AGAINST FURTHER INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, this morning's papers carry a report of a letter sent by retired Gen. James J. Gavin, formerly chief of the Army's research and development program, who served as U.S. Ambassador to France upon his retirement and who is now chairman of the board of Arthur D. Little, Inc., warning against further escalation of the war in Vietnam.

The reports state in part:

To increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi—or even Peiping—will add to our problems rather than detract from them, and it will not stop the penetrations of North Vietnamese troops into the south. Also, if we were to quadruple, for example, our combat forces there, we should then anticipate the intervention of Chinese volunteers and the reopening of the Korean front.

This seems to be the ultimate prospect of the course we are on now.

I ask unanimous consent that the account of this warning contained in the New York Times this morning, January 17, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL GAVIN TERMS WAR EFFORT TOO COSTLY AND RISKY TO PURSUE

(By Jack Raymond)

WASHINGTON, January 16.—James J. Gavin, a retired lieutenant general and former Ambassador to France, has declared that U.S. military objectives in South Vietnam are stretching the resources of American forces "beyond reason."

To shield all of South Vietnam against the Vietcong insurgency, he said, would require many times as much force as is being employed.

Yet, he warned, if the United States applies the force needed to attain its military goals, it must expect Communist China to enter the war in South Vietnam and reopen the Korean front as well.

General Gavin offered his military-technical opinion of the Vietnamese situation in a letter to Harper's magazine, published today in the February issue.

Discussing alternatives, the general proposed a permanent end to bombing of North Vietnam and a decision to limit U.S. military operations to holding coastal enclaves in South Vietnam. Meanwhile, an ultimate solution should be sought at the United Nations or in a Geneva conference, he said.

With his letter, General Gavin became the first well-known military professional to dispute the "falling domino" theory—the contention that an American withdrawal from Vietnam would set off widening Communist takeovers, each southeast Asian nation pushing the next one into communism until the threat reached Hawaii.

"I do not for a moment think that if we should withdraw from Vietnam the next step would be Walkiki," General Gavin wrote. "The Kra [Malay] Peninsula, Thailand, and the Philippines can all be secured, although we ultimately might have heavy fighting on the northern frontier of Thailand."

Withdrawal from Vietnam would pose serious problems, the general wrote, "but the problems that we would then have to deal with would be far less serious than those associated with an expression of the conflict."

General Gavin, 58 years old, is board chairman and chief executive officer of Arthur D. Little, Inc., an industrial research concern in

Cambridge, Mass. A well-known combat commander in Europe in World War II and in Korea, he retired from the Army in 1951 as chief of research and development after having criticized restrictions put on the Army in missile development. He was Ambassador to France in 1961 and 1962 under President Kennedy.

In his letter on the Vietnamese war, General Gavin recalled that he was the Army's chief of plans and operations in the 1950's when the United States was considering entering the war against the Vietminh forces of Ho Chi Minh, now President of the North Vietnam. The Vietminh defeated the French in 1954.

"We were talking about the possibility of sending 8 divisions plus 35 engineer battalions and other auxiliary units into the Hanoi delta," General Gavin wrote. He indicated a planned initial commitment of 200,000 men, compared with 190,000 American troops now in Vietnam.

"We had one or two old China hands on the staff at the time," the General recalled, "and the more we studied the situation the more we realized that we were in fact considering going to war with China, since she was supplying all the arms, ammunition, medical and other supplies to Ho Chi Minh."

The General added: "If we would be in fact fighting China, then we were fighting her in the wrong place, on terms entirely to her advantage. Manchuria, with its vast industrial complex coal, and iron ore, is the Ruhr of China and the heart of its warming capacity. There, rather than in southeast Asia, is where China should be engaged if at all."

General Gavin recalled that it was Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, the Army Chief of Staff, who dissuaded President Dwight D. Eisenhower from committing troops to Indochina.

"The time has come," General Gavin said, "when we simply have to make up our mind what we want to do and then provide the resources necessary to do it. If our objective is to secure all of South Vietnam, then forces should be deployed on the 17th Parallel and along the Cambodian border adequate to do this."

"In view of the nature of the terrain, it might be necessary to extend our defenses on the 17th Parallel to the Mekong River and across part of Thailand. Such a course would take many times as much force as we now have in Vietnam."

"To increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi—or even Peiping—will add to our problems rather than detract from them, and it will not stop the penetrations of North Vietnamese troops into the South. Also, if we were to quadruple, for example, our combat forces there, we should then anticipate the intervention of Chinese 'volunteers' and the reopening of the Korean front."

"This seems to be the ultimate prospect of the course we are on now."

GOVERNMENT ACCESS TO PRIVATE RECORDS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, a very able young lawyer on the staff of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, Mr. Charles Helein, had an article printed in the St. Louis Bar Journal—Winter 1965—entitled "Government Access to Private Records—Ignoring the Fourth and Fifth Amendments."

As this very good article is of immediate interest to the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT ACCESS TO PRIVATE RECORDS—IGNORING THE FOURTH AND FIFTH AMENDMENTS

(By Charles H. Helein)

Few of us conduct our lives without the compilation of a variety of records detailing our activities, associations, financial dealings, health, education, etc. Few of these records are created upon a voluntary basis. More often, records are required to be kept either by government mandate or the necessities of commerce. The shift of the credit-based economy and the increased involvement of government in the health, education, welfare, and economy of the Nation underlie the growth and detailed scope of records.

Today, a credit check of the exact financial status of almost any American can be obtained in a relatively short period of time. The amount of insurance a man carries, how he invests his money, his business or profession, or the religion he follows may be determined through the various companies engaged in the gathering and exchange of information.¹

The Federal Government maintains a vast compilation of records on its citizens—tax returns, census forms, insurance and loan applications, military service records, civil service forms, investigative reports, securities registrations, etc. To a greater or less degree, all of these records, as well as those maintained by private firms, are accessible to Federal investigators and inspectors.² Congress has granted broad authority to various Federal agents to subpoena other records of private firms and individuals.³ Judicial decisions have upheld these powers of inquiry and in some cases bestowed the power of inquisition.⁴ The courts usually find such a broad power necessary to the effectuation and maintenance of some governmental program.⁵

The purpose of this article is twofold. A review of some of the statutory and court decisions granting or denying access to the Government to records will be made. The dangers to the full realization of the guarantees of the fourth⁶ and fifth⁷ amendments due to the compilation and availability of records will be outlined.

The Supreme Court first approached the issue of the proper scope of governmental

¹ Packard, "The Naked Society" (1964).

² There is a vast difference between the training and competency of an investigator, such as an FBI agent, and an inspector, such as a Food and Drug Administration inspector. Cf. Hearings on Invasions of Privacy Before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 89th Cong., 1st. sess. (1965).

³ Int. Rev. Code of 1954 § 7802; The Federal Trade Commission Act § 9, 38 Stat. 722, 15 U.S.C. § 49 (1914); Interstate Commerce Act, pt. I, § 1, 62 Stat. 909, 49 U.S.C. § 12 (1948).

⁴ *United States v. Powell*, 379 U.S. 48 (1964) (Internal Revenue summons); *United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 633 (1950) (Federal Trade Commission subpoena); *Endicott Johnson Corp. v. Perkins*, 317 U.S. 501 (1943) (Department of Labor subpoena).

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ U.S. Constitution amend. IV. The fourth amendment provides: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized."

⁷ U.S. Constitution amend. V. The pertinent provisions of the fifth amendment provides: "No person shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself."

access to private papers and records in the landmark case of *Boyd v. United States*.¹¹ The Government filed a suit for the forfeiture of goods for fraudulent nonpayment of customs duties. The Government had to prove the value of the goods. To do so, it sought the production of the defendant's invoices on goods previously shipped into the United States. The lower court ruled that failure to produce the invoices would render confessed the allegations of the Government. After registering strenuous objections, the defendant produced his invoices.¹²

Speaking for the majority, Mr. Justice Bradley held that the compulsory production of the defendant's books and records violative of the guarantees of both the fourth and fifth amendments.

"A compulsory production of man's private papers to establish a criminal charge against him, or to forfeit his property is within the scope of the fourth amendment to the Constitution, in all cases in which a search and seizure would be; because it is a material ingredient, and effects the sole object and purpose of the search and seizure."¹³

"The compulsory production of incriminating documents by an illegal search and seizure was cut from the same mold as compelling incriminating testimony; 'in this regard the fourth and fifth amendments run almost into each other.'"¹⁴

"The Court was aware of the insidious nature of slight encroachments by the Government under legal guise and swiftly and decisively moved to place itself foursquare against such activity."¹⁵ Such action was viewed as an affront not only to freedom-loving Americans, but also to all men of liberty.¹⁶

"Any compulsory discovery by extorting the party's oath, or compelling the production of his private books and papers, to convict him of crime, or to forfeit his property, is contrary to the principles of a free government—it is abhorrent to the instincts of an American. It may suit the purposes of despotic power; but it cannot abide the pure atmosphere of political liberty and personal freedom."¹⁷

Eight years later, the Supreme Court reviewed a case in which a similar issue was raised.¹⁸ The Interstate Commerce Commission was granted power to compel testimony, the appearance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, etc.¹⁹ The power was to be exercised pursuant to the Commission's duty to regulate the common carriers under their jurisdiction. The Commission wished to question the defendant about the reasonableness of his rates. He refused to testify or to produce his books or other records. The Court did not reach the merits in the

case, but remanded it to the Commission for further hearings. The Court did reaffirm their position taken in *Boyd*.²⁰ Mr. Justice Harlan stated the majority's opposition to the exercise of a general power of inquiry into the private affairs of citizens by an administrative agency.²¹

After the early 1900's, the advent of a more complex society and the necessity for an increased governmental role in that society's well-being caused the Court to retreat somewhat from their positions taken in *Boyd* and *Brimson*. The chipping away of the rigid adherence to the inviolability of private records enunciated in the two cases began in 1911.

In *Flint v. Stone Tracy*,²² a unanimous Court upheld the constitutionality of a tax law that provided that returns, when initially filed with the Internal Revenue Service, would be treated as public records. After a period of time the returns would be open to inspection under rules prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury and approved by the President.²³

Another unanimous decision, handed down the same year, upheld the Interstate Commerce Commission's power to require common carriers to submit monthly reports under oath.²⁴ The reports contained the occasions on which the carriers' employees remained on duty for a period in excess of that allowed by congressional mandate.²⁵ The carrier raised the objection that such reports violated the fourth and fifth amendments; but to no avail.

In holding that there was no violation of the fourth amendment, the Court found the order of the Commission to be suitably specific and reasonable, ruling that there could not be, in such case, an unreasonable search and seizure. Disposing of the carrier's fifth amendment objections, the Court relied upon *Hale v. Henkel*.²⁶ This case established the personal nature of the privilege against self-incrimination and that as such, the privilege could not be invoked by officers of a corporation in favor of the corporation.

A decade later, the Federal Trade Commission sought to compel the production of a corporation's records, contracts, memoran-

dums, and correspondence for an entire year.²⁷

The FTC's statutory granted the unlimited access to all records of a corporation under its jurisdiction.²⁸ This time the agency did not prevail.

Mr. Justice Holmes expressed the views of a unanimous Court condemning the broad inquisitorial nature of the FTC's order.

"Anyone who respects the spirit as well as the letter of the fourth amendment would be loath to believe that Congress intended to authorize one of its subordinate agencies to sweep all our traditions into the fire * * * and to direct fishing expeditions into private papers on the possibility that they may disclose evidence of a crime. The interruption of business, the possible revelation of trade secrets and the expense compliance with the Commission's wholesale demand would cause the least considerations. It is contrary to the first principles of justice to allow a search through all the respondent's records, relevant or irrelevant, in the hope that something will turn up."²⁹

It should be noted that the American Tobacco case enjoys only limited precedential value as protection against administrative harassment. Decisions handed down after the Second World War have all but emasculated the rule against fishing expeditions.

In *Oklahoma Press Publishing Co. v. Walling*,³⁰ guidelines were set forth governing the right to inspect and require production of records kept pursuant to a statutory program.³¹ The Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor issued a subpoena duces tecum for the company's records to determine if there had been a violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act.³² In sustaining the subpoena, the Court set the following standards: (1) No specific charge or complaint of violation of law need be pending in order to keep the demand of the agency within the bounds of the fourth amendment; (2) It is sufficient if the investigation be for a lawfully authorized purpose within the power of Congress to command and that the records sought be relevant to the inquiry; (3) adequate, but not excessive, specification of documents to be produced.³³

Mr. Justice Murphy dissented.³⁴ He was unable to approve the use of nonjudicial subpoenas issued by administrative agencies.

"Administrative law has increased greatly in the past few years and seems destined to be augmented even further in the future. But attending the growth should be a new and broader sense of responsibility on the part of administrative agencies and officials. Excessive use or abuse of authority can not

¹¹ *Federal Trade Commission v. American Tobacco Co.*, 264 U.S. 298 (1924).

¹² *Federal Trade Commission Act* § 9, 38 Stat. 722, 15 U.S.C. § 49 (1914).

¹³ *Federal Trade Commission v. American Tobacco Co.*, supra note 23 at 305, 306.

¹⁴ 327 U.S. 186 (1946).

¹⁵ The decision was handed down 5 years after *United States v. Darby*, 312 U.S. 100 (1941) which held that Congress can require records to be maintained as a means of enforcing an otherwise invalid law. The records were kept pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

¹⁶ 52 Stat. 1060, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 et seq. (1938).

¹⁷ Mr. Justice Rutledge, writing for the majority, did caution against excessive inquiries by administrative agencies: "Officious examination can be expensive, so much so, that eats up men's substance. It can be time consuming, clogging the processes of business. It can become persecution when carried beyond reason." *Oklahoma Press Publishing Co. v. Walling*, supra note 26 at 213.

¹⁸ *Oklahoma Press Publishing Co. v. Walling*, supra note 26 at 218.

¹⁹ *Boyd v. United States*, supra note 8.

²⁰ *Interstate Commerce Commission v. Brimson*, supra note 14 at 478.

²¹ 220 U.S. 107 (1911).

²² The Court did not decide the issue of whether the fifth amendment had been violated as that issue was not raised. The Court did explicitly hold that the fourth amendment was not violated. *Ibid*.

²³ *Baltimore & Ohio R.R. v. Interstate Commerce Commission*, 221 U.S. 612 (1911); *Cf. Wilson v. United States*, 221 U.S. 361 (1911).

²⁴ *Interstate Commerce Act*, pt. I, § 7-9, 63 Stat. 486, 49 U.S.C. § 20 (1949). Section 20 sets out the type of reports that may be required by the Commission to be kept and which the Commission can inspect.

²⁵ 201 U.S. 43 (1906). Defendant Hale was subpoenaed to appear before a grand jury to testify on the conduct of his company in relation to the anti-trust laws. Hale refused to testify or to produce his books and papers. In a seven to two decision, Mr. Justice Brown pronounced the personal nature of the privilege against self-incrimination. In addition, a corporation as a creature of the state, depending on the state for its existence, must submit to an inquiry when the state sought to elicit whether or not the corporation had violated its privileged status bestowed by the state. *Cf. Foster v. United States*, 265 F. 2d 183 (2d Cir. 1959), cert. denied 360 U.S. 912 (1959) wherein the taxpayer and his bank were not allowed to raise the fourth amendment as protection against examination of the bank's records pertaining to the taxpayer; *Zimmerman v. Wilson*, 105 F. 2d 583 (3rd Cir. 1939).

¹¹⁶ U.S. 616 (1886).

¹¹⁷ "The compulsory production of the invoices in effect incriminated the defendant though the action was in the nature of a civil proceeding for forfeiture of goods. Mr. Justice Bradley wrote: 'We are also clearly of the opinion that proceedings instituted for the purpose of declaring the forfeiture of a man's property by reason of offenses committed by him, though they may be civil in form, are in their nature criminal.'" *Id.* at 633.

¹¹⁸ *Id.* at 622.

¹¹⁹ *Id.* at 630.

¹²⁰ "Illegitimate and unconstitutional practices get their first footing * * * by silent approaches and slight deviations from the legal modes of procedure. This can only be obviated by adhering to the rule that constitutional provisions for the security of person and property should be liberally construed." *Id.* at 635.

¹²¹ *Id.* at 631.

¹²² *Interstate Commerce Commission v. Brimson*, 154 U.S. 447 (1894).

¹²³ *Interstate Commerce Act*, pt. I, ch. 104, § 12, 24 Stat. 383 (1887).

of the effect of the acceleration of corporate tax payments enacted in 1964.

At the time the bill was being considered we prepared estimates of the effect of the acceleration, assuming that corporate profits continued at the 1963 levels. These estimates are as follows:

Effect of acceleration of corporate tax payment	
	Millions
1964.....	+\$230
1965.....	+710
1966.....	+1,260
1967.....	+1,340
1968.....	+1,340
1969.....	+890
1970.....	+800
1971.....	+180
1972.....	0

The actual level of corporate profits increased in 1964 and again in 1965. The tax collections reported by the Internal Revenue do not separate the accelerated payments, but from the collections as reported we estimate that the effect of the acceleration in the fiscal year 1965 was close to \$1 billion. For the current fiscal year, 1966, we now expect that the speed-up will increase receipts by an amount between \$1½ and \$2 billion. We use a range for this year because we do not have a firm figure for corporate profits in 1966, and we have not carried the revision through the years beyond 1966.

I hope this information meets your needs.

Sincerely yours,

LAURENCE N. WOODWORTH,
Chief of Staff.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to make one further comment about truth in government. That pertains to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation has borrowing authority up to \$14.5 billion. As of their most recent statement they owed the U.S. Government \$12,129,383,000.

On that same date, the investment that was in inventory and loans to Commodity Credit Corporation was only \$6,233,896,646. If the Government were able to liquidate its entire holdings of agricultural commodities and obtain in return therefor the full investment plus all storage costs—which we do not believe they can do—it would amount to \$6,233 billion, or a deficit of \$5,895 billion.

This actual loss has not been faced by the administration in its budgetary requests, with the result that a true picture of our deficit is reduced by that amount.

A truth-in-government policy would correct this misleading information.

This nearly \$6 billion does not consist entirely of last year's deficit. Part of it is last year's, and part of it is from the year before. It relates to the last 2 or 3 years. However, they are deficits which have been realized but not written off.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLAND] last year tried to get Congress to recognize that method as being unrealistic and unfair, and tried to get Congress to appropriate money so that we could show the true cost.

I supported the Senator on that proposal, and I complimented him on his effort. However, we were not successful because the administration did not want the American people to know that there is another \$5 billion that has been spent. The administration did not want to admit the true deficit.

Mr. President, we need truth in government. While the administration has this subject on its mind and is advocating the need for truth in lending and packaging all I ask is that it start practicing what it is preaching and give us some truth in Government. The administration should tell the American people just exactly what these programs will cost and what will happen to the American dollar if spendthrift policies of this administration are continued.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield. Mr. SIMPSON. I compliment the Senator from Delaware on the excellent presentation that he has made to the Senate today. It is very important that this subject be taken into consideration during our deliberations in the Senate.

It is my understanding that the national payroll of Federal employees will exceed more than \$2½ million this year. The administration has already confessed that bills passed in the last session will call for the employment of an additional 100,000 employees. Does the Senator know what that would add to the deficit?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not have the exact figures, but the amount would be substantial, I assure the Senator. There is no question that those extra people will be employed. As I said before, the Government has access to no mysterious sources of income. It distributes back to the taxpayers a part of what it takes from them in the first instance. As we establish these new programs we inevitably establish a new bureaucracy.

That is why I say that the taxpayers are bound to lose in connection with these Federal aid programs. About 20 percent of the amount involved will be used to pay the salaries of the bureaucracy which will be set up here in Washington to distribute the money to the taxpayers. This bureaucracy will be set up for the purpose of distributing the money back to the taxpayers and telling them how to spend it.

No one gets anything for nothing out of the Federal Government. Some day we will wake up to that truth.

LETTERS TO VIETNAM SOLDIERS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, some fine young students at Woodrow Wilson High School, Beckley, W. Va., recently wrote open letters to American soldiers in Vietnam, and the letters were published in the Beckley Raleigh Register.

The letters bear evidence of the fine spirit which I believe is more prevalent among American youth than is the regrettable attitude shown by a small minority of students, which has been given wide and damaging publicity as a result of the demonstrations and protest marches against our Nation's role in southeast Asia.

I commend the Junior Historian Club of Woodrow Wilson High School for its activities in this sphere, and for the breadth of vision shown by initiating this correspondence, and I particularly congratulate Nicky Joe Rahall, Cheryl

Toombs, Mike Griffith, and Peggy McGowan for their forthright and articulate patriotic expressions. It is interesting to note that Nicky Joe Rahall won top honor in the 1965 "Voice of Democracy" contest in Raleigh County and went on to compete for the district title. He is an example of the worthwhile young people coming to maturity in my State. The son of a prominent Beckley, W. Va., businessman, he is also the grandson of an immigrant from Lebanon who over 50 years ago peddled merchandise over the hills and among the coal-mining community in the Beckley area of West Virginia and who, in later years, made significant contributions to the community life of the region.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letters, as published by the newspaper, printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the published letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Beckley (W. Va.) Raleigh Register, Nov. 7, 1965]

BECKLEY, W. VA.,
November 1965.

DEAR SOLDIERS IN VIETNAM: The members of our club, as citizens of the great country you are fighting for, wish to thank you for all you are doing for us in Vietnam.

Our country was established by people who were deeply concerned that the rights of men should not be violated. The United States has always stood for these rights. This Nation has waged great wars to protect our own people and people of other nations from despotic rulers. Is this country to change its policy now?

No, now more than ever before, the United States is needed to combat communism and preserve the American tradition. Now, more than ever before, the individual soldier is important in defending this tradition which millions in years past have lived and died to defend. Mere numbers of troops cannot win this war, only the determination of every man to do his duty.

We are concerned about every American soldier in Vietnam. Through newspapers and television we see the kind of life you must live. We hope that through this short message we can show just a small amount of appreciation for the work you must do. We also wish that each and every American would express to you the thankfulness we feel as you defend our homes, families, and countries on the other side of the world.

Again thank you. May God grant to you a safe and speedy return to America.

JUNIOR HISTORIAN CLUB,
Woodrow Wilson High School.

The Junior Historian Club of Woodrow Wilson High School has gone on record as supporting the U.S. role in Vietnam in contrast with many extremist youths throughout the country who are staging organized protest.

The junior historians state their policy in the above letter.

A series of four articles written by junior historians on the war will appear in this week's Register.

[From the Beckley (W. Va.) Raleigh Register, Nov. 8, 1965]

DEAR VIETNAM SOLDIER

(EDITORS NOTE.—This is the first of a series of four letters supporting American's role in Vietnam. The articles are written by members of the Junior Historian Club at Woodrow Wilson High School.)

TO AMERICAN MEN IN VIETNAM: Our prayers are with you and our praise is for you. America stands tall because of your courage.

January 17, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

393

essary to appeal for public charity. And the spendthrift policies of the Great Society are responsible for this gradual erosion of the value of the dollar.

This Government cannot spend itself into prosperity on borrowed money any more than a man can go out on Monday morning and drink himself sober. One is as ridiculous as the other.

The Great Society must accept the full responsibility of the inflation which they have deliberately planned.

If we study the history of inflation in any country we will find that inflation does not hurt the big man. Most of the investments owned by such people consist of fixed assets, stocks, securities, or perhaps television stations. The more wealthy own X percent of America, whether it is valued at \$1 million or \$2 million. It would not make any difference. He would still own X percent of America, and as inflation expands, his net worth increases.

However, a workingman or a man who is trying to live on a fixed salary or a pension is the one who really suffers under inflation, and he is the man who cannot afford it.

I believe that it is high time that we have a true truth-in-government policy and that this administration should stop trying to camouflage the costs of its program with a lot of fancy labels in an attempt to deceive the American people.

The administration should tell the people exactly what these programs cost and what the deficit is. Instead they are pauperizing the aged in this country and promoting a policy by which the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

The administration is pauperizing the very people for whom they are expressing sympathy and shedding crocodile tears.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be incorporated in the RECORD a statement by the Secretary of the Treasury showing how these accelerated payments on the corporate taxes and graduated withholding will increase the tax revenues in the fiscal years 1966 and 1967. These are the figures which I have just outlined. In addition, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a letter signed by the Secretary of the Treasury under the date of December 17, signed by Joseph W. Barr, Acting Secretary, in which he outlines the \$2.5 billion profit that can accrue as a result of the so-called seigniorage, or the changing of the silver content of the coins. I also ask unanimous consent that a statement dated January 6, 1966, by the Joint Committee on Taxation showing the result of acceleration of the corporate taxes under the 1964 law. The first chart shows the results of the suggestion contained in the President's message.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated revenue effects on President's tax proposals (assuming Mar. 15, 1966 enactment)

(In millions of dollars)

	Receipts increase	
	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967
1. Excises:		
Local and long-distance telephone, and teletype-writer service (if effective Apr. 1, 1970).....		700
Automobiles (if effective Mar. 15, 1966).....	60	420
2. Corporate income tax payment speedup (if effective Apr. 15, 1966).....	1,000	3,200
3. Graduated withholding system for individual income taxes (if effective May 1, 1966).....	35	400
Total (administrative budget effect).....	1,155	4,810
4. Self-employment tax, social security quarterly payment (if effective June 15, 1966).....	100	100

1 Estimate refers to effect upon cash budget receipts.

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Office of Tax Analysis, January 1966.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, December 17, 1965.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: The following information is supplied in response to your letter of December 3, which was previously acknowledged.

1. The acceleration of corporate tax payments provided in the Revenue Act of 1964 produced estimated additional receipts of approximately one and a quarter billion dollars during fiscal years 1964 and 1965 combined.

2. Seigniorage profits on the new coinage will depend upon the production necessary to catch up with current demands and meet future demands for coins. Seigniorage in fiscal years 1966 and 1967 combined has been estimated at from under \$1.5 to \$2.5 billion. These estimates are under review in connection with the 1967 budget. Beyond these years, after the backlog in demand has been met, seigniorage receipts can be expected to fall sharply, perhaps to \$200 to \$300 million per year.

Seigniorage profits are covered into the general fund of the Treasury as miscellaneous budget receipts. Minor amounts are automatically appropriated for expenses of coinage distribution and wastage, and the costs of alloy metals used in subsidiary silver coins, but otherwise seigniorage is not earmarked for specific purposes. Again, in connection with the 1967 budget, President Johnson has requested Secretary Fowler, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to study the accounting treatment accorded seigniorage and to make appropriate recommendations.

Whether seigniorage is an artificial receipt or not, is, of course, a matter of definition. Seigniorage from coinage has always been a continuing, although minor, receipt item. The bulge in seigniorage receipts expected in fiscal years 1966 and 1967 represents largely a catching up on the sharp rise in demands for coins in the past several years.

3. Profits from the sale of silver bullion amounted to about \$13 million during the

fiscal years 1961-65. Receipts from this source are covered into the general fund of the Treasury as miscellaneous budget receipts.

4. Proceeds from the sales or disposition from the strategic and critical materials stockpile during the fiscal years 1961-1965 amounted to \$595.5 million. This was covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous budget receipts. Of the total amount, \$49.9 million was set aside in a special fund to cover the major portion of the costs of acquisition and operations of the strategic and critical materials stockpile. The remainder, \$545.6 million, was used to support general fund expenditures. The year-by-year receipts were as follows:

(In millions of dollars)

1961.....	80.1
1962.....	53.4
1963.....	74.0
1964.....	129.5
1965.....	258.5

The original purchases of materials in the national stockpile were reflected as budget expenditures at the time the purchase transactions took place. The proceeds from subsequent disposal of surplus materials from the stockpile are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Inventories accumulated under provision of the Defense Production Act of 1950, while separate from the strategic and critical materials stockpile (national stockpile) discussed above, are reflected in the determination of total stockpile objectives and as such are included by some in their definition of national stockpile. Proceeds from the sales from the Defense Production Act inventory during fiscal years 1961-1965 amounted to \$192.3 million. These proceeds are treated as income to a public enterprise revolving fund and are thus deducted from the funds expenses in arriving at net budget expenditures. The year-by-year sales the Defense Production Act inventory were as follows:

(In millions of dollars)

1961.....	34.0
1962.....	37.8
1963.....	14.5
1964.....	31.6
1965.....	74.4

5. The Treasury gold stock on December 31, 1964, amounted to \$15,388 million. On December 6, 1965, the total was \$13,809 million. The decrease is principally the result of foreign purchases of gold although total sales included moderate domestic sales for industrial and artistic purposes.

Sales (or purchases) of gold, whether domestic or foreign, are treated as exchanges of assets; i.e., the reduction in the Treasurer's gold is offset by an increase (decrease) in his deposit balances. For this reason, these sales do not affect budget expenditures nor the deficit. Sales of gold, of course, reduce our total gold reserves.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH W. BARR,
Acting Secretary.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL
REVENUE TAXATION,
Washington, January 6, 1966.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in reply to your request to Mr. Vall, chief clerk of the Senate Committee on Finance, for estimates

January 17, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

395

As you probably know there have been demonstrations here in the United States against the American policy in Vietnam and against our very presence in Asia. Please rest assured that this is a minority movement, the work of what you might call "extremists," who you will probably find have been against everything that is done by the United States.

These groups, in my opinion, are uneducated as to why we are fighting in Vietnam and they do not realize that the future of the United States is indirectly involved. They should realize that the failure or withdrawal of American troops would be disastrous for democracy and help establish a larger Communist foothold in the world with the next step coming down on the United States directly.

When my military career approaches, as it soon will, I would not hesitate to fight in Vietnam for my country.

Most of the American hearts are with you in Vietnam.

Men, thanks for doing your best, and I hope you can feel the support of the American people behind you. We want to see you in the near future living here in the United States and enjoying the fruits of your labor. Upon you, our men in Vietnam, rests the destiny of the United States of America.

Sincerely,

NICKY JOE RAHALL.

[From the Beckley (W. Va.) Raleigh Register, Nov. 9, 1965]

DEAR VIETNAM SOLDIER

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the second in a series of letters written by members of the Junior Historians Club of Woodrow Wilson High School to servicemen in Vietnam.)

TO OUR BRAVE FIGHTING MEN: Your purpose in Vietnam, your being in that strange country, is one of today's most honorable duties; you are protecting the freedom of the entire world, as well as that of your own country. Without you, communism would take over and then spread like a horrible plague all over the world. You are guarding our very lives as freemen, and yet some condemn you for it.

I wonder if they ever really thought about what living under a tyrannical government such as that of Russia would mean. Do they realize that, without our boys in Vietnam, Russia's communism would sweep over America, and future generations would be brought up knowing freedom no more—except as something that existed long ago?

This letter is to let you know that I, for one, am very grateful that you are there to insure freedom, and highly commend you for your part in the preservation of democracy for mankind.

Sincerely,

Miss CHERYL TOOMBS.

[From the Beckley (W. Va.) Raleigh Register, Nov. 10, 1965]

DEAR VIETNAM SOLDIER

TO OUR BOYS IN VIETNAM: Our efforts in Vietnam have recently been questioned by an organized protest from some of the students in the United States. These groups have been proven to be a minority group. The predominate feeling, however, is backing fullheartedly the administration's present policy in Vietnam.

We realize that we have to stop Communist oppression now, for the consequences for delaying our actions against these aggressors will be much worse than our casualties now.

We owe a great deal of gratitude to you who are defending our principles in Vietnam. The United States was founded and has survived because of our determination to pre-

serve democracy. Only by this same determination can the United States survive in the future. Your supreme effort in Vietnam could possibly be rewarded by the establishment of a free and peaceful world with no fear of aggression.

Sincerely,

MIKE GRIFFITH.

[From the Beckley (W. Va.) Raleigh Register, Nov. 12, 1965]

DEAR VIETNAM SOLDIER

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the last of four letters, written by members of the Woodrow Wilson Junior Historian Club, dedicated to fighting men in Vietnam.)

DEAR SOLDIERS: Keep fighting. The heavy burden of preserving our democracy falls on your shoulders. In your hands, you hold the weapons to destroy the communism that is slowly devouring our democracy. We have spoken our policies. Now, we must fight for them.

It was nearly two centuries ago when this country was established. The world has since wondered how long a democracy can exist? Is it strong enough to back its policies by force?

Up to this time, America has stunned the world. She is a living example of a democracy, surviving in a world of communism.

Today, however, we face entirely new conditions. Western Europe has recovered its economic strength and military potential. Russia commands a vast war machine with a full nuclear arsenal. Can our country stand up to these powers?

America is not an imperialistic nation. Her aim is to defend the rights of people in Vietnam and to stop the spread of communism.

Many Americans are against our policy in Vietnam. They burn their draft cards, and many go as far as to burn themselves. What purpose does this accomplish?

Meanwhile in Vietnam, soldiers trudge through the hot sun for 21 cents an hour. They face such problems as hunger, leeches, disease and bullets. These men really stand for something. They make me proud to be an American.

Thank you, soldiers, for your outstanding example and the great courage you have displayed in Vietnam. May God bless you and bring you safely home to our beloved America.

A loyal West Virginian,

PEGGY MCGOWAN.

RETIREMENT OF DR. HUGH
ELSBREE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it was with regret that I learned that Hugh L. Elsbree, Director of the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress, will retire from that position in February.

Dr. Elsbree has served the Federal Government with distinction for more than 21 years—19 of them in the Library of Congress and the last 7 of them in his present position. A political scientist of wide repute and a dedicated public official, Dr. Elsbree has earned the respect and the confidence of the Congress through his skillful and competent leadership of the Legislative Reference Service in a period when Congress has experienced its greatest need for research assistance.

L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress, in announcing Dr. Elsbree's forthcoming retirement, paid tribute to the standards of excellence that Dr. Els-

bree has set for the analytical studies and reports produced for Congress.

Dr. Elsbree came to the Library in 1945 as research counsel in the Legislative Reference Service. He was already splendidly equipped to take on the responsible task of providing consultative assistance to Members of the Congress. A graduate of Harvard University, where he received his B.A., M.A., and Ph. D. degrees in political science, he was also a Sheldon traveling fellow in Paris and Geneva. He joined the Harvard faculty in 1928 and taught government there until 1933.

In 1931 the Harvard University Press published his study, "Interstate Transmission of Electric Power," and in 1934 he had his first experience in public service, acting for several months as a research specialist for the Federal Power Commission. From 1933 until 1943 he was on the faculty of Dartmouth College, holding the position of chairman of the political science department from 1937 to 1941. He became a war service employee in 1943, serving as principal business economist at the Office of Price Administration until 1945, when he joined the staff of the Bureau of the Budget as administrative analyst. In November of that year he went to the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

In 1946, Dr. Elsbree was promoted to senior specialist in American government and public administration, the highest research position in that subject in the Legislative Reference Service, a position, incidentally, created by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide Congress with the highest level of staff assistance. His expert analyses, his thorough background briefings, his penetrating studies of legislative issues, especially in the fields of governmental reorganization and executive-legislative relations, were models of professional staff competence. His work was so highly regarded that several congressional committees sought to borrow him for extended periods. In 1951-52 Dr. Elsbree served as Acting Assistant Director of the Service.

In 1954 the newly created Commission on Intergovernmental Relations—the well-known "Kestnbaum Commission"—pressed the Library for his services and he was released on loan. As its deputy research director, Dr. Elsbree provided unusual skill and leadership for the Commission's complex task, and he was highly praised for his role in the successful conclusion of the study. When he returned to the Library in October 1955, he was appointed Deputy Director of the Legislative Reference Service. He left the Service for a brief period in 1957 to accept the chairmanship of the political science department at Wayne State University. In 1958 he came back to the Library to be Director of the Legislative Reference Service, and that he has served in that capacity since that time.

Dr. Elsbree has shaped and reshaped the Legislative Reference Service to meet Congress always changing and, it seems, ever-enlarging needs. A recent example of this administrative sensitiv-

ity has been demonstrated when Dr. Elsbree advocated and the Library obtained congressional authorization to establish a Science Policy Research Division within the Service. This is now providing assistance in the fields of science and public policy, fields of intense governmental involvement where choices involving billions of Federal dollars are made each session.

Under Dr. Elsbree's guidance, the work of the Service has had a profound, although usually unpublicized, effect on the legislation enacted by the Congress. The Legislative Reference Service researcher provides much basic information and many analyses which clarify the problems and the issues, pinpoint the strengths or weaknesses of proposed solutions, evaluate the alternatives, and assist in many other ways in facilitating the legislative process. If the work of the researcher for Congress is normally confidential, it is nevertheless real and substantial, and the many commendations which Dr. Elsbree and his able staff have received from Members and committees of Congress attest to it.

Fortunately for us in the Congress and for the Library, Lester S. Jayson, who has served as Dr. Elsbree's deputy for 4 years and who came to the Library as chief of Legislative Reference Service's American Law Division from the U.S. Department of Justice where he had served in various capacities for 10 years, has been appointed as director of the Service. I am confident that he will carry on the traditions of the Service.

I know that my colleagues in the Congress wish Dr. Elsbree well as he retires and want to thank him for his selfless and dedicated service to this body. It is my information that January 27 will be his last day of active duty.

MR. GEORGE J. TITLER—NEW UMWA VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the United Mine Workers of America has just chosen as its new vice president Mr. George J. Titler of Beckley, W. Va., a man who, in the truest sense of the statement, "came up through the ranks." From the days when he labored as a coal miner, following World War I, in the State of Iowa, on through the years in which he subsequently served as head of UMWA District 29 at Beckley, he has been a dedicated advocate of measures to protect and advance the interests of our Nation's coal miners.

He is well known for his acts of humanitarianism and generosity, such as personally providing a year of financial assistance for various college freshmen.

The Beckley, W. Va., Post Herald and Register on January 16 reported the appointment of Mr. Titler as UMWA vice president, and I request unanimous consent to have this newspaper article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—George J. Titler, of Beckley, W. Va., was chosen Saturday as the new vice president of the United Mine Workers Union.

The \$40,000-a-year job in the past has been a steppingstone to the presidency of the independent union, now held by W. A. (Tony) Boyle.

Titler, 70, at present is head of UMW District 29, at Beckley.

His selection as vice president was by unanimous approval of the executive board, a UMW spokesman said.

The board had been considering the selection of a vice president for the past week. The post became vacant with the retirement of Raymond O. Lewis, brother of former UMW President John L. Lewis.

Titler, a native of Pennsylvania, served in World War I. After that he worked in the coal mines of Iowa for 15 years. In 1937 he was sent by the UMW to Harlan County, Ky., where he was head of an organizing drive which ended in 1941. He transferred that year to West Virginia where he has lived ever since.

Others in the running were Joe Yablonski, president of district 5 in western Pennsylvania; Harrison Combs, assistant director of the union's legal department; and John M. Kmetz of Nanticoke, Pa., director of the union.

Titler became president of district 29 in 1942.

Although considered the dark horse candidate this year, Titler is no stranger to the political wars of the UMW.

In 1947 he was mentioned as a possible successor to John O'Leary, UMW vice president, who died of a heart attack. And in 1953 he was named by Coal Age magazine as one of the five strongest contenders to take the chair of UMW President John L. Lewis.

Since his election as secretary-treasurer of district 17 of the UMW in 1942, Titler has been a controversial figure.

He was noted as vehemently opposed to the Taft-Hartley bill, which, he charged, was written to destroy the union.

In 1946 he lashed out at the Fayette County political "machine," charging that it would never carry a coal miner on its ticket, except for an occasional candidate for the house of delegates.

In 1947 he spoke out against a plan to cut miners' overtime pay to 96 cents an hour. He labeled the proposal "a screwy idea."

Yet the coal official also was viewed as a man who could lend support, shown during World War II when he urged unity between miners and operators, with high wages for miners, so more defense bonds could be purchased to aid in the national crisis. And during late Gov. William Marland's administration Titler supported the chief executive's proposed severance tax on West Virginia coal.

WEST VIRGINIA POSTMASTER HONORED

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on Thursday, January 20, Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien will present special merit citations to 14 postmasters in the United States who have significantly improved the exterior and grounds of their post office buildings as part of President Lyndon B. Johnson's natural beauty program. The award presentation will take place in the Postmaster General's reception room in Washington, D.C.

Among the postmasters to be so honored is Mr. James Dinsmoore of St.

Marys, W. Va., who has been postmaster of the second-class post office there since 1956. His work in improving the grounds surrounding the postal facility, at no cost to the Federal Government, has been recognized by the Post Office Department. As Postmaster General O'Brien said in announcing the award:

Post offices across the Nation are becoming leaders in President Johnson's natural beauty program. Postmasters, local postal employee groups, flower and garden clubs, and individual citizens are all cooperating in the project. The post offices have become local showplaces.

I am pleased that Postmaster James Dinsmoore is to receive a merit citation for participation in this program, and I am sure that the St. Marys post office is a true source of civic pride for the citizens of that community and surrounding area.

WILD RIVERS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1446) to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild Rivers System, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon I sent to the desk an amendment contemplating the incorporation into the pending bill, for study as prospective inclusion in the final draft of the bill, two rivers in Ohio. They are the Little Miami River and the Little Beaver River.

Up to this time these two rivers have not been despoiled of their natural richness by the invasion by human beings. They are still substantially in their pristine condition. The streams are clear streams. Their borders are lined with trees in great abundance. This natural beauty should be protected against future spoliation. The rivers should be protected from the contamination that results from the invasion by industry and an increasing population.

One of these rivers, the Little Miami River, runs through Clark County of which Springfield is the county seat; through Greene County, of which Xenia is the county seat; through Warren County, of which Lebanon is the county seat; and through Clermont County, of which Batavia is the county seat. It begins in the vicinity of Clifton, Ohio, in Montgomery County.

The Little Beaver River, with its north and middle forks in Columbiana County, runs from a point in the vicinity of Negley and Elkton, Ohio, downstream to a point in the vicinity of East Liverpool, Ohio, where it runs into the Ohio River.

In my judgment these rivers should be included in the bill.

The rivers are rich in gorges. Although from a comparative standpoint the gorges are small, as one enters the area, one feels that he is in some remote region still possessed of its pristine natural beauty.

I believe that these streams should be included in the bill. I therefore call up

Appendix

Acheson on Our Vietnam Policy: An Asian Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Dean Acheson, one of our outstanding Secretaries of State, and during a trying period in our country's and the world's history has written an interesting and sound article on South Vietnam, which appeared in the Washington Star of January 16, 1966. The views of former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, which I include in my remarks, are worthy of profound consideration.

ACHESON ON OUR VIETNAM POLICY: AN ASIAN GREECE

(By Dean Acheson)

"I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure."

The country referred to was poor, its poverty aggravated by foreign occupation and years of warfare. Guerrillas were creating political chaos and making economic recovery impossible. The existence of the state itself was threatened by large forces supplied, organized, and led by neighboring Communist movements. Many of these forces had taken part in the struggle against foreign occupation.

The Communist leaders had previously signed an agreement for peace but had hidden their weapons and resumed the conflict at the first signs of recovery. The national military forces were unequal to the renewed, foreign aided and directed attack.

The country's government was far from any democratic ideal. Previous aid had proved inadequate. The American Government had to decide whether to go further with funds, armaments, and the necessary military advisers. The President's conclusion was summed up in the sentence quoted above.

THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE

The year was 1947, the country, Greece; the President, Truman; and the policy enunciated, the Truman doctrine. It instantly received bipartisan support in Congress and for nearly 20 years, during four administrations, has been the policy of the United States. Under it necessary help was given in Greece, Turkey, Korea, Lebanon, and now in Vietnam to prevent Communist takeover "by armed minorities or by outside pressure," or by both.

Nineteen years ago, when the policy was first adopted, the United States was in the early stages of its education in methods of Communist conquest. In the immediate postwar years it learned how, in countries occupied by Soviet armies, Communist regimes were set up under the protection and opposition liquidated. This happened throughout Eastern Europe.

The next step was attempted in countries left in confusion by the war but not occu-

pled by Soviet troops. Here internal subversion, instigated and supplied and controlled by outside Communist states, made an armed bid to take over the government. This was the form used in Greece and eastern Turkey. The Truman doctrine labeled this as aggressive Communist expansion and announced the necessity of stopping it. The aggression failed due to massive help given by the United States.

The next stage of the Communist assault did away with pretense. South Korea was openly invaded by organized army units from the Communist base outside. American and allied Armed Forces successfully came to the aid of South Korea.

WAR OF LIBERATION

The current method of Communist expansion, employed in Vietnam, is the so-called war of national liberation. In these wars there is an attempt, as there was in Greece, to cloak as an internal insurrection Communist subversion directed and supplied from outside, and there is added a Korea-like invasion by regular army formations from the neighboring Communist state.

Our decision to help South Vietnam resist this attempted subjugation involves principles and policies, all of which were already public and established by 1950. They in turn resulted from an appreciation of the lessons of the 1930's—Manchuria, Ethiopia, the Rhineland, Czechoslovakia—that aggression must either be met early before it has gathered momentum or it will have to be checked later under more adverse conditions.

SAME OLD COMPLAINTS

The complaints now raised at protest meetings on Vietnam are the same which have been directed against all our efforts to aid peoples resisting Communist subjugation. Our opponents are usually praised and those we are aiding criticized.

We were told that the terrorists, guerrillas, and belligerents in Greece were patriots who had fought the Nazis and whose aim was to replace a corrupt, demoralized government; that the evidence that they were serving foreign Communist purposes was flimsy; and that the United States was intervening in a purely Greek civil war. On the other hand, the Greek Government was denounced as weak, unrepresentative of the people, particularly of the resistance, and as the creature of the Western allies.

Similar unflattering comments were made about the late Syngman Rhee, President of Korea. But the fact now seems too plain for argument that in both Greece and Korea, the intervention and help of the United States preserved the opportunity to develop toward democratic government by consent. No such similar development can be noted in neighboring Balkan States or North Korea.

So, today, it is argued that government in Vietnam is not and has not been democratic and, therefore, is unworthy of American support. But the existence of a democratic system is not the criterion of worthiness of American support. That criterion is determined and demonstrated effort in resisting attempted subjugation. Can there be more impressive evidence of such determination and effort among the people of South Vietnam than they are now giving? For they are fighting on after suffering military and civilian casualties which on the basis of comparative populations are equal to nearly 1 million American casualties. Their purely military casualties on the same basis are

fully 10 times greater than those we suffered in Korea.

When, as in China and Cuba, a government facing Communist-led forces failed to retain the support of its people, its numerically superior forces simply melted away. But in South Vietnam the government forces continue to grow in numbers and aggressiveness.

Not a single political figure or politically significant group in South Vietnam at the time Diem was overthrown or since has shifted allegiance to the Vietcong or been unwilling to continue the struggle.

MILLION REFUGEES

Finally, there is the record of those who voted with their feet, the million refugees who left the north for South Vietnam after the Geneva accord of 1954 and the hundreds of thousands of refugees who in 1965 alone have left Vietcong areas for government-controlled ones. The South Vietnamese people and army are fully justifying American assistance by willingly continuing to bear the brunt of what remains their struggle for independence.

Fortunately, there is also in Saigon and in Washington not only determination to suppress the belligerency, but an understanding of the importance of political consent in furthering the struggle for independence.

In South Vietnam, even in the midst of devastating warfare, the maneuvering and instability which have characterized the government since the fall of Diem show both a shift in power and attempts to reach the new balance by taking into account the aspirations of the Buddhists, the Catholics, the civilian politicians, the military establishment, students, the sects, and the geographic regions.

The search for such a balance is not a substitute for political method, but there has also been progress in that direction. Though it seems to have largely escaped public notice, elections for the municipal and provincial councils were held in South Vietnam last May. Observers agree that they were conducted in a fair and orderly manner and that the candidates substantially reflected local sentiments. Over half the eligible voters were registered and over 70 percent of those registered actually voted. In North Vietnam there can be found, of course, no glimmering of democratic political method.

VITAL TO UNITED STATES

The fate of the people of Vietnam is of the same vital concern to the United States as that of those whom in the past we have helped to resist subjugation. Indeed the situation in Asia today is reminiscent of the problems the United States confronted in Europe in 1947. The United States faces in Communist China an aggressive nation imbued with the same primitive Communist theology which the Soviet Union had 20 years ago, and possessing (as the Soviet Union did) military resources far greater than those of her neighbors. The area to the south, afflicted by foreign occupation and years of war, offers an invitation to aggression by means of the war of national liberation. Only the United States has the resources to make resistance possible.

The Chinese Communists have made it clear that Vietnam is another test of that strategy in Asia for the aggrandisement of the Communist world. The Communist Chinese minister of defense, Marshal Lin Biao, in a speech on September 3, referring

A141

A150

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

January 17, 1966

Referring to a report of the Citizens Committee for Higher Education, of which he's chairman, Goheen said of the group's urging of a 10-year capital construction program totaling \$427 million by 1975: "This may seem way out of the ballpark. But it's just that we in New Jersey haven't known what the ballpark really is."

Twentieth Anniversary of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the remarks of Mr. Ralph Feder, chairman of the Teaneck United Nations Committee which he made at the annual dinner sponsored by this organization. This dinner was held on October 23, 1965, at the Fairleigh Dickinson University in Rutherford, N.J.

It is my hope that the Members of this honorable body will take the few minutes time it requires to read these exceptionally well-phrased statements and will note that they have a very poignant meaning to us at this particular time.

The remarks of Mr. Feder follow:

Your excellency Ambassador Vincl, other distinguished guests on the dais and friends all of the United Nations:

For the third year it is my great privilege to welcome you to Teaneck's annual commemoration of the founding of the United Nations. Twenty years have elapsed since the hour of its birth, a blessed event, preceded by the pangs of a suffering humanity.

We are practical people. None of us is so naive as to imagine that the present is like that remote past, that the conditions of life today are exact duplicates of the situation in 1945. Two decades ago, life did not possess the revolutionary qualities it has today. The original 50 founding nations could not then have projected the quick demise of colonialism, and the proliferation of smaller nationalities in Africa and Asia, that would swell their membership to 117. Who then could have foretold the stumbling blocks yet to be encountered by nations whose national interests would conflict with world interests? Within 20 years, membership in the thermonuclear club has risen far beyond any expectations silently nursed in 1945. Nor have the years left us scarless, in the tragic and sudden deaths of devoted sons of the United Nations, who expended their lives in its service: Count Bernadotte, Dag Hammarskjöld, America's Adlai Stevenson.

And, nonetheless, we rejoice. Despite our awareness of frustrations, we celebrate tonight a birthday. The very fact that, despite the weaknesses that have bothered and continue to bedevil the U.N. we can still rejoice, tells us a great deal about ourselves, about the dimensions of our humanity, and about the U.N. itself. As the late President Kennedy said, "Never have the nations of the world had so much to lose—or so much to gain. Together we shall save our planet, or together we shall perish in its flames. Save

it we can, and save it we must, and then shall we earn the eternal thanks of mankind."

To be able to enjoy a birthday, to be happy about someone's growing older, is a talent reserved for special kinds of people. For example, they are reasonable people, who have a capacity for enjoying the process of growth. Reasonable, or better, reasoning people, are those who rejoice at the birthday of the U.N. because they are convinced that each day of its presence brings us closer to the universal practice of reason, as the only way of overcoming tension among nations.

These are people who refuse to be victimized by fancy or myth. These birthday celebrants refuse to knuckle under the fantasy that only war can resolve national differences. They are people who have perceived the glorious vision that this globe is part of a different kind of creation, a creation founded upon a reasoned order, whose laws of physical balance approve and demand a similar balance in man himself, and in his dealings with other men.

Not only reasoning men, but freemen exult at this anniversary of the U.N. The enslaved and those who enslave others cannot exult. For them, every tomorrow dissolves into yesterday's pain and emptiness. For them life has no importance other than to dominate or to be dominated. But freemen can exult in life, for they know its value. They know the exultation of the life that chooses to live. Free Americans can rejoice in this birthday of an organization that seeks to foster the self-determination of people long oppressed. They see their own struggle to be free magnificently reflected in the U.N.'s work, in releasing human potential for creativity all over the world. In this extension of mankind's dimension, they themselves grow in their own humanity.

"Thy youth shall see visions." Yes, the very best birthday partyers are not only the reasonable and the free, but, and especially, the very young at heart. Youth is happy about birthdays, because it has a capacity to dream and to plan and to fashion a better tomorrow. Very quickly in life, they detect injustice and inequity, and they have the audacity to demand that life be better, that there be an end to the things that dehumanize us.

We who tonight rejoice at the U.N.'s existence, are we not as young as they? Are we not still filled with the vision of 20 years ago? Next week our children will collect for UNICEF. They will do so because they know that other children starve in our world, that other children go naked in our world, that they are homeless and motherless and friendless under a gaping sky. If we can rejoice tonight, it is because, like them, we, too, are young and concerned and ashamed that other human beings are forced to lead substandard lives. We rejoice, because we see the dent that the U.N. has made in the wall of man's pain and suffering. We hail its unsung heroes, who have cured 37 million children of the yaws, and 11 million more of trachoma, and another million of leprosy. We rejoice for the U.N. teams that have protected 162 million people against tuberculosis, and lowered the incidence of malaria by over a hundred million people a year. We rejoice for those nameless men and women of the U.N. who have helped to find new homes and new lives for more than a million refugees.

Faith in reason, in freedom, in youthful idealism has made our Nation great, and helped create the U.N. It is our faith tonight. Let nothing, then, diminish our rejoicing at this birthday party.

Have We Stopped Losing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a Member of the House just back from a tour of southeast Asia told me the other day that there were reasons to doubt that McNamara was correct when he said last November that the United States had stopped losing the war in Vietnam.

Of course the Secretary of Defense has done more to confuse the American people as to the true situation in Vietnam than almost seems possible.

In 1962 he was quoted as saying he was tremendously encouraged. In October 1963 he gave as his judgment that the major part of the U.S. military task could be completed by the end of 1965. And a month later in Honolulu, he announced that American troops would start being withdrawn before yearend.

On March 17, 1964, he said the situation could be significantly improved in the coming months. A few days later he repeated that the situation in South Vietnam had worsened.

In May, however, he reported excellent progress, but 1 day later told a congressional committee that anti-Vietcong efforts had deteriorated.

In February 1965 he summed up his views saying that the past year had brought some encouraging developments. Last November after a sixth visit, he told the press, as I said at the start, "We are no longer losing."

Mr. Speaker, let me get back to the statement of the Member of Congress whom I cited at the outset as telling me he had reasons to question that we have stopped losing the war. This was from a Congressman fresh back from southeast Asia.

Since I quoted this in a House speech recently, I have been pressed for further details.

I do not know the final answer, of course, but I am told Americans and that United States and South Vietnam forces hold less territory now than they did a year ago. In the past it has always been the practice to gage victory in war, on the basis of which force won and held territory.

However, it looks like ultimate defeat or victory in Vietnam will come, not on the battlefield, but rather at a peace conference. If this holds true, politics being what it is with the President and his party urgently needing a settlement before the next election, many people fear defeat could come at any time because Johnson and his advisers would sign on any terms. That is why I have so consistently called for all facts to be given to the American people. Otherwise, if the people are misinformed and confused, public opinion will have no bearing on the outcome, which could be disastrous.

January 17, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A149

Deliberately, then, your administration saw fit to interpret the welfare of the American people, their small businesses and their livelihood, in the terms laid down by a few giant oil companies. The fruits of an industry that would have meant bread and butter to American citizens in ordinary walks of life were diverted to increase the swollen profits of international profiteers. The same interests are profiting again by U.S. offshore production in the Gulf of Mexico that is absorbing most of the growth in demand.

No credit is due to your administration for the now rising demand for domestic crude. It was built on the ruination of a substantial portion of the small business economy in petroleum States and a subsequent collapse of production and reserves. Temporary demand will not reverse the declining trend. It but accents the prediction now being realized—

Unless the U.S. oil policy is modified to serve the minimum requirements of domestic industry, American oil reserves will vanish. U.S. citizens will then be exploited by international interests in times of peace, and they will be at the mercy of their enemies at each threat of war.

This message is sponsored by members of the Kansas independent oil producing industry.

Panelists Stress Need for Educational Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, with growing numbers of qualified high school graduates wanting to enter college, the need for more higher educational facilities becomes imperative, as well as the necessity of increased faculty salaries.

In New Jersey alone, 4,000 applicants were turned away by colleges last fall, because of a shortage of facilities. That problem is faced by virtually every State and the main obstacle is the same: insufficient funds.

The Higher Education Act of 1965, which I voted for, will provide some help to New Jersey. It will receive \$11,949,000 in the 1966 fiscal year from this program, including \$1,319,000 in educational opportunity grants.

Although this Federal aid is encouraging and appreciated, much more assistance is needed if the colleges and universities in our State are to provide the facilities required by high school graduates.

In connection with this vital and urgent goal, the Daily Home News of New Brunswick, N.J., sponsored its sixth annual Round Table Conference, with three university presidents and an industrial executive comprising a panel which discussed, "The Future of Higher Education in New Jersey."

The article, written by Frank Kelly, entitled, "Panelists Stress Need for Educational Funds," follows:

PANELISTS STRESS NEED FOR EDUCATIONAL FUNDS

(By Frank Kelly)

The ever-increasing need for funds to provide for the State's burgeoning college-student population was underscored repeat-

edly at the sixth annual Round Table Conference sponsored yesterday by the Home News.

So too was the urgency for stepped-up salary scales for college faculty members to put New Jersey institutions of higher education on equal footing with counterparts in other States in the recruiting battle for topflight teachers.

These needs, it was stressed, are both current and continuing.

From New Jersey homes there are 50,000 students attending colleges within the State, said Dr. James Hillier, vice president of RCA Laboratories.

Hillier, who dug deep into the complexities of the college education picture as a member of the Governor's Committee on New Jersey Higher Education, said expansion is planned to accommodate 2,000 more students annually.

"But by 1970, we'll need about 40,000 new spaces, and another 60,000 on top of that by 1975. The situation is so big, so serious, and we've fallen so far behind that we're just numbed by the problem. The population boom is here now and will be with us for years to come."

The research management expert said that as of today, higher education in the State is between \$100 million and \$150 million in arrears in capital facilities.

Pinpointing the problem as getting the public to recognize its responsibilities, Hillier asserted: "It bothers me. We're living in this tax-free paradise, while sponging on other States."

This was in reference to his earlier statement that besides the 50,000 New Jerseyans who are staying in the Garden State for their education, some 60,000 are seeking it at out-of-State institutions.

While he believes that New Jersey's elementary and secondary school programs are solid, Hillier said industries in this State suffer recruiting losses. Prospective employees, out of states with children, go elsewhere when they view New Jersey's "spotty" higher education system.

UNWILLING LEGISLATURE

The conference moderator, James Kerney, Jr., publisher of the Trenton Times and a former member of the State tax policy commission, ascribed much of the lag in higher education aid to an unwilling legislature. He believes the public, conversely, "is more willing to be taxed in this area and others * * * where it wasn't 10 years ago."

By and large, the panel which also included Dr. Mason W. Gross, president of Rutgers University; the Most Reverend John J. Dougherty, auxiliary Bishop of the Archdiocese of Newark and president of Seton Hall University; and Dr. Robert F. Goheen, Princeton University president, agreed with the recommendations of the Governor's committee for setting up a cabinet-level agency to wrestle with New Jersey's needs in higher education.

The committee, headed by Dr. Carroll V. Newsom, former president of New York University, urged revision of the current administrative structure—the State department of education and the State board of education.

Quality in higher education—how to insure it when involved with a large student body—was discussed by Gross.

He said paying attractive salaries to faculty members is a necessary condition but not an absolute assurance of top-caliber instructional quality.

Gross observed that at Rutgers (where 4,000 New Jerseyans were turned away last fall because the university was filled) the present student body was assembled "from the top down," based on secondary school records.

COULD ACCOMMODATE MORE

Such a competent collection of students has made teaching much easier, he continued, but this isn't doing the job State in-

stitutions should. He indicated there's an obligation to a much larger segment of New Jersey's youth—who could be accommodated if sufficient funds were forthcoming.

At present, he said, Douglass College probably draws its student population from the top 10 percent among high school student bodies; Rutgers, from the top 20 percent.

Gross spoke of the dual aim of a university: To aid students to gain knowledge in a particular field they have selected; and to instill an interest in culture. Anything less, he said, and the student winds up with "a truncated education."

He said too that class size is a prime consideration, that ideally faculties should be augmented at a ratio of 1 instructor for every increase of 12 in the student population. But, because of a lack of funds, it "doesn't work out."

Biggest roadblock barring better salaries for Rutgers instructors, Gross went on, is the current arrangement by which State board of education approval is essential for pay increments.

And, as the Governor's committee pointed out: Fixed by the State board, salary schedules for various academic ranks are the same at State (teachers') colleges, Rutgers and the Newark College of Engineering.

PRESIDENT HANDICAPPED

Pay for a new faculty member is set at the minimum figure stipulated for his academic rank. Thus, the school's president is under a severe handicap when negotiating with prospective faculty members.

Resultant inequities Gross cited included this one: State colleges in New Jersey compare favorably salarywise with those in other States but Rutgers lags substantially behind other States' universities.

Sounding the dilemma of the private institution was Bishop Dougherty. Reading from a report in a 1962 issue of the Seton Hall University alumni magazine, he said that from 1947 to 1962 a 104-percent increase in the student population occurred in public (tax-supported) institutions of higher education compared to only 29 percent in private (non-tax-supported) schools.

"In 1950, 50.7 percent of the Nation's students attended private colleges; in 1954, 44 percent; in 1961, 39 percent."

"Private institutions—the weaker ones—I conclude, will be priced right out of existence because of the competition (with public schools) based on caliber of students and caliber of faculties."

Bishop Dougherty asked: "Can we (private institutions) match instructors' salaries with those paid by public institution?" He echoed a Citizens Committee for Higher Education suggestion that a stipend be given to the student who prefers to attend a private college or university in New Jersey—a stipend in proportion to his needs to finance such attendance.

"We feel this would be a definite help * * * in aiding the balance between public and private institutions."

NEED MORE PROFESSIONALS

Principal dynamos in American society since World War I ended, said Goheen, have been science and technology. He spoke, too, of the Nation's swelling populace and resultant changes in the economy, the need for more professionally trained men and women—lawyers, doctors, welfare workers.

"There's a need today for a diversified multilevel system of education throughout the United States"—from the 2-year community college to postdoctorate degree programs.

Higher education in New Jersey, he declared, is "badly undernourished, lagging in planning and in opportunities available."

However, Goheen voiced a measure of optimism: I'm deeply impressed with the degree of concern expressed by leaders and by just plain, ordinary people all over the State. It gives me some hope that things will start to move to make up for some of these lags."

January 17, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A151

A Congressman recently told the Wall Street Journal that the thing that scares him is the President signing his name to almost anything in order to get a settlement. My point is, no such thing will happen if the American people are told the full story because public opinion is a powerful influence.

Meanwhile, in spite of McNamara's statement that we have stopped losing the war, here are a few facts from Senator MANSFIELD's report which could contradict this.

The Vietcong force in South Vietnam is double that of 3 years ago. Their strength is steadily increasing.

Introduction of U.S. forces—

The report says—
have blunted but not turned back the Vietcong drive. The lines remain drawn in South Vietnam in substantially the same pattern as when the United States increased its commitment.

The Mansfield report frankly admits that the war has expanded into Laos and is beginning to lap over the Cambodian border. Worst of all, it concludes that there are no grounds for optimism that the end is likely to be reached within the confines of South Vietnam or within the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, if these facts make it appear as though we have stopped losing, there is something wrong with my eyesight. Especially this opinion should be considered in the light of the fact that the Vietcong, as I have pointed out before, hold more territory today than they did a year ago. The picture is not bright and the people should know it.

Hon. Herbert Bonner

SPEECH
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of HERBERT BONNER the Nation has lost a wise and able statesman. But, more particularly, the American Merchant Marine has lost a champion and skilled architect. No man labored more or gave more unstintingly of himself on its behalf throughout almost three decades than did HERB BONNER.

The fast, modern greyhounds of the seas, which today carry the American flag to the farflung corners of the globe, stand in living tribute as a monument to the endeavors of this one man. These same ships, constructed as a result of the vision and foresight of HERBERT BONNER, are today bridging the oceans to supply American troops in Vietnam. Seamen and American fighting men throughout the world owe a great debt to this man. Truly, one can say that memorials to his achievements are now in being throughout the world wherever American-flag merchant ships ply their trade.

But to me the death of HERB BONNER means much more. I have lost a warm and personal friend with whom I have labored side-by-side for more than 13

years. He was a close confidant. He was a man whose counsel I held in greatest respect. He was a man whom I grew to love more with each passing year.

Perhaps the English poet laureate, Robert Southy, best expressed my feelings when he said, and I quote:

The loss of a friend is like that of a limb; time may heal the anguish of the wound, but the loss cannot be repaired.

To his devoted and gracious widow, Eva, I can only say that her sadness is shared by HERBERT's legion of friends and admirers. Perhaps this fact will make her burden just a little easier to bear.

Remarks of Congressman William M. Tuck, Democrat, of Virginia, at the Annual Meeting of the Virginia Association of Soil and Water District Supervisors at Richmond, Va., January 11, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on last Tuesday, January 11, the Honorable WILLIAM M. TUCK, of the Fifth District of Virginia, addressed the annual meeting of soil conservationists in Virginia and made a splendid address.

Congressman Tuck served as Governor of Virginia from 1946 until 1950 and has an intimate knowledge of the problems of water and soil conservation not only in our State but throughout the Nation. His remarks are so timely and so interesting that I would like to commend them to the reading of the Members of the House.

I take pleasure in inserting his address in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM M. TUCK, DEMOCRAT OF VIRGINIA, AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF SOIL AND WATER DISTRICT SUPERVISORS AT RICHMOND, VA., JANUARY 11, 1966

It is a pleasure to participate in your annual meeting, and to meet with you experts in the conservation and development of our land and water resources. There is nothing more basic to our economy and welfare than our natural resources. It is an inescapable fact that what we do with our natural resources will not only affect our social and economic welfare of today, but also pave the way for future developments.

Although I am not a conservation expert, I am well acquainted with the soil conservation movement. I am aware of the need for a technically sound conservation plan on all land, whether it is farmland or not. I am proud to say that my own farm is a better one for the use of the technical know-how that has been developed in the last 30 years.

I am not a stranger to the soil conservation movement in Virginia. I have followed it as a member of the general assembly, as Governor, and as a Member of Congress. I have noted with great interest the concern of the people of Virginia in our great land and water resources. I have seen interest in soil conservation grow through the expanded soil conservation district programs. I believe in these programs and have expressed my support of them in the Congress.

In Virginia, we have already come face to face with soil and water problems that every community faces today.

The rapid growth of population demands space for homes, industries, highways, schools and playgrounds, shopping centers, and recreation areas, as well as the water, sewage, and other facilities that must accompany this growth. While in Virginia the expansion is most noticeable near the large metropolitan areas like Washington, Norfolk, Richmond, Roanoke, and Petersburg, it is by no means confined to them. Practically every small city and town is experiencing this growth. The State is actively encouraging industry to move in. The highway system is being improved and linked into the interstate systems. Tourism is big business and is growing. State and local planning groups and commissions are working on long-range land-use plans. Health and sanitary agencies, county planning and zoning boards, housing developers, and county governing bodies are becoming aware that we need careful, long-term planning if we are to make the best use of our land and water.

Our internationally famed Dulles Airport in Virginia near Washington is a showcase for aviation industry. It is also a showcase for conservation and its part in developing land to protect a community during and after construction. It reflects credit on the work that soil conservation districts are doing, and the tremendous part they can and should plan in nonagricultural development of rural land. It is an example of teamwork between a soil conservation district and Federal agencies.

The Potomac River is another of our attractions. What is done on much of our northern Virginia land contributes either to the beauty and usefulness of this great river or to its pollution.

I know that the soil conservation districts within the Potomac River Basin have been working in the hope of making this stream a model of scenic and recreational values. I believe the work they are doing to keep the soil on the land is one of the important phases of our program to beautify the Potomac. Nearer Washington, urban development and other problems are going to have to be dealt with also. I hope that you as experts in conservation and development of our land and water resources will make yourselves heard and be a part of the campaign to clean up this historic river that has the potential to provide beauty, pleasure, and relaxation to those who live nearby and to those who come from all over the world.

The Potomac River and the Dulles Airport are showcases that are open to view by visitors from far and wide. However, the conservation work that you are doing throughout Virginia is no less vital to the health of our natural resources, to the economy of the State, and to the welfare of its people.

Congress, since it set up the mechanism through which the soil conservation movement began over 30 years ago, has continued to add tools for use in resource conservation. It has supported sound conservation programs.

In this decade, the U.S. Congress has broadened the soil and water conservation program by new legislation and by amendments to the old.

The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act has been amended to strengthen the assistance available from the Federal Government in order to make the program more effective. A 1962 amendment provided for Federal assistance in developing public recreation facilities and water storage for future municipal or industrial use. The amendment enables local communities to make greater use of the multiple-purpose principle.

Fortunately, one resource can often be put to many uses. And when local people and public agencies work together, the results are far better than those obtained

when development is piecemeal or through programs with single-purpose objectives.

Our growing population and the complexity of our economy are adding new dimensions to the problem of resource management in this Nation. There are more claimants for natural resources and resource products, and the result is conflict and competition. This increases the need for multiple use so that several needs can be satisfied from a given source. It creates the need for coordination so that waste and mismanagement can be prevented.

The small watershed program provides for the multiple-use concept and it adds some other highly important ingredients—local leadership, local coordination, and local participation. Undoubtedly the involvement of local people is the reason the program has been so effective.

Our Mountain Run watershed project in Culpeper County has gained nationwide attention since it was dedicated in 1961. I am very proud of it. It is an example of the economic benefits a community can obtain through a multiple-purpose project that provides a dependable water supply and overcomes the threat of flood damages.

I am told that, since the national small watershed program began, reservoirs that have been built, or that have been authorized, will provide water to more than 100 cities and towns ranging in population from a few hundred to about 70,000, and totaling over 624,000. Since the 1962 amendment, interest in including water supply in watershed projects has increased considerably.

Development of public recreation facilities in watershed projects has also been stepped up considerably since the 1962 amendment. I understand that recreation is included in 67 of the projects designed since 1962, and that they will provide over 4 million visitor-days of recreation annually when completed.

I am well pleased that Virginia has taken advantage of the provisions of these amendments. Ten of the 25 watershed projects you are installing are multiple purpose. Nine of them include municipal water supply and one of these also includes recreation. More than 100,500 people in Culpeper, Keysville, Madison, Staunton, Luray, Drakes Branch, Chatham, Louisa, and Mineral and in Albemarle and Augusta Counties will benefit from the water supplied from reservoirs in these projects.

During the calendar year 1965, congressional committees approved for operations 99 projects—the largest number in any 1 year since the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act was passed in 1954. About 65 percent of these projects were designed for municipal water supply, recreation, or agricultural water management, in addition to flood prevention.

For this fiscal year, the Congress has increased the watershed protection appropriation to relieve the backlog of worthy watershed projects that have been planned and are ready to move ahead.

The drought conditions in the eastern United States during the last 3 years has made us all more conscious of the need to plan carefully for water supply. It has generated interest in local water problems. It has also brought farm and nonfarm people together to work out long-term plans and come up with something that is beneficial to all segments of the community.

Demand for land and water are increasing so rapidly that only by this type of teamwork can the available resources satisfy the needs. There is just so much land and water. We have to make the best use of it. This requires careful planning. You are experts in the conservation field. Your experience, your know-how, is sorely needed in resource planning. I urge that your soil conservation district programs include plans to make the best use possible of land and water

resources to enhance the economy of the entire community.

We cannot afford to waste water in our homes, in industry, or on our farms. We cannot afford to let good usable water run off to waste, eroding our farmlands, flooding our valleys, and silting up our reservoirs and waterways in the process.

In 1965, the Congress added other tools through which the Nation's water and other resource problems can be evaluated and relieved.

The Rural Water and Sanitation Facilities Act, for example, provides loans and grants to plan and construct community water supply and sanitation facilities in rural communities not in excess of 5,500 population.

The Water Quality Act provides for the establishment and enforcement of water quality standards for interstate streams. It increased Federal grants for construction of community sewage projects.

The Water Resources Planning Act provides for Federal and regional coordination of plans for water resources development. It authorized Federal matching grants for the States for development of water resource programs.

The Federal Water Projects Recreation Act provides uniform policies for fish and wildlife enhancement and recreation in Federal multiple-purpose water resource projects.

Other legislation is aimed at creating more jobs and economic opportunities in hard-pressed areas through resource development. The Appalachian Regional Development Act and the Public Works and Economic Development Act both provide for stepped up or expanded resource development activities.

The cropland adjustment program, aimed at removing surplus production, emphasizes shifting land into public benefit uses that also conserve soil and water to meet future needs. It also offers opportunity for landowners to receive increased payments if they open their land to the public for recreation uses such as fishing, hunting, hiking, and trapping.

Future legislation will continue to reflect the needs and wants of the people. It will reflect the changes of the time—changes in resource demands and conservation and development problems, expanded population, changes in land use, leisure time, and the affluency of the Nation.

I consider resource conservation and development an important part of making rural America a place of opportunity for all who dwell there. I consider it extremely worthy of support by the U.S. Congress, by State legislatures, by cities, and by counties, and by the people—all the people, for they are the beneficiaries.

This year the Congress increased Soil Conservation Service funds \$9.5 million over last year. The SCS contribution to soil and water conservation activities in Virginia during fiscal year 1966 will amount to an estimated \$4.5 million. This is more than double the 1960 figure.

The Virginia State Legislature appropriated \$232,600 for soil and water conservation work in fiscal year 1966. This includes \$93,075 for planning watershed projects and \$14,520 for installing projects. It also includes \$80,000 to help speed up completion of soil surveys in counties that have urban conservation problems or where problems are anticipated.

The value of local governmental contributions to help carry out the program of local soil conservation districts in Virginia for fiscal year 1966 is approximately \$69,715.

One of the most important ingredients to the success of the conservation program is local financial support. As the conservation job becomes more complex, the State and local funds will need to be increased—not to take the place of Federal funds, but to supplement them or to extend their effectiveness.

Of the 25 million acres within the bound-

aries of the 31 soil conservation districts in Virginia, I note that basic conservation plans have been made on only 5.5 million acres. The plans have been fully carried out on only 2.4 million acres.

I realize that not as much technical help is available as needed. I know that Federal technical assistance in planning and applying conservation measures is limited. That is why government at all levels must give financial support to the conservation program. That is why I opposed the proposal before Congress last year that required farmers to pay part of the cost of the technical assistance that has been free from the Federal Government. I believe that it would curtail conservation work that benefits the farmers and the whole community. I believe that it would have set conservation back 30 years and have laid us wide open to future conservation problems.

The demands on our land and water resources in the next few decades will grow tremendously. To meet the requirements for food, for recreation, for industry, for places for an expanding population to live, work, and to go to school, for highways, reservoirs, forest products, will call for wise planning and efficient management of our resources. We will need to prevent erosion and flood damages to our valuable land. We will need to improve water resources, to prevent water shortages, and to avoid water waste.

I think we have an excellent team. There is no doubt that we can do it. But it will take the involvement of both land users and consumers, both rural and urban people. Only then will we be able to go full steam ahead.

Smiling Fortune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, with thousands of young men being drafted, some destined to leave their wives and others their sweethearts for duty in distant lands, including Vietnam, the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star is well worth reprinting:

SMILING FORTUNE

The world may be a cynical old place, but now and then our faith is restored when fortune smiles in the right direction. On Patrick John Nugent, for example. Like many draft-age Americans, Pat faced a possibly long separation from his fiancée—who happens to be the President's daughter, Luci. Fortunately, his basic training as an activated Air National Guardsman took place at a Texas Air Force base near the L.B.J. ranch. This allowed him to see Luci on weekends, and all was well.

But anxiety must have stalked the young couple. What happened when basic training was completed? What about those long 4 months remaining on Pat's military commitment? It was a dilemma, all right, but fate again intervened. By coincidence, Pat will spend the remainder of his active duty at Andrews Air Force Base. To be sure, Andrews is 10 long miles from the White House. A kinder fate would have assigned him to the White House heliport. But the Air Force managed to compensate for this cruelty by arranging for Pat to live off base when not on duty.

Some Congressmen have grumbled about the chain of coincidences which has kept Pat and Luci together. But this is the churlish viewpoint. We happen to believe it all